HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW
VOLUME XLVIII JULY, 1955 NUMBER 3

PAUL AND THE MANUAL OF DISCIPLINE

SHERMAN E. JOHNSON
CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE PACIFIC
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

IN A PREVIOUS article I have dealt with the striking parallels between the Dead Sea Manual of Discipline (1QS) and the Book of Acts and the special material of Matthew.[1] The organization of early Christianity in Jerusalem, particularly its conservative or Judaizing wing, strongly suggests the Dead Sea sect at several points. The more liberal Christianity of Stephen and the Epistle to the Hebrews may, however, also have contacts with the Qumran sect's idea of spiritual sacrifices and its protest against the Jerusalem Temple. In addition there are parallels between the Dead Sea literature and the Pauline epistles but they are very different from the ones just named.

The Jerusalem church and the Qumran sect run parallel at certain points where Paul diverges. Both Judaean communities take for granted the framework of the Jewish Law. Their governmental discipline is firm and the leaders wield considerable authority. By contrast, while Paul retains the ethical principles of the Old Testament, at least in some of his letters he repudiates the absolute authority of the old code. The interpretation and application of it to specific problems must be controlled by the Spirit, speaking either through the apostle, the church, or the individual Christian. Even though the words of Jesus had unquestioned authority, there would have been no place in the Pauline churches for a Mishnah, a Manual of Discipline, or a Didache of the Twelve Apostles.

If Corinth is any example, the Pauline churches had no such firm organization as the Jerusalem church. Paul himself might

[1] S. E. Johnson, "The Dead Sea Manual of Discipline and the Jerusalem Church of Acts," Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft, LXVI (1954), 106–20.

have wished to exercise considerable authority over them, but in fact he did not. The teaching of freedom which he — and perhaps others — had brought seems effectively to have removed any central control, and Paul would not tolerate any attempts of the Jerusalem church or its emissaries to impose authority on his own foundations.

Pauline Christianity of course shares with the Jerusalem Church some characteristics which also have parallels in the Qumran community, for example Baptism, the Lord's Supper, the idea of a church of the New Covenant founded by an authoritative Teacher, some aspects of biblical interpretation, and the ethical imperative to share with those who were in need. Most of these are, however, inevitable in any Christian church, and have their roots in Judaism. Such, for example, is the Pauline and Old Testament rule that by the mouth of two or three witnesses every word shall be established (II Cor. 13:1; cf. Matt. 18:16); such is the power of the church to excommunicate serious offenders.[2] Other parallels, such as "Give room for the wrath of God. . . Vengeance is mine" (Rom. 12:19; cf. 1QS 10:18) and "Sing with understanding" (I Cor. 14:15; cf. 1QS 10:9) are part of the general Jewish heritage also.

Of the points mentioned above, only one stands out as calling for particular discussion — this is the New Covenant. It is well known that, while in Mark's account of the Last Supper, Jesus refers to the Cup as "the blood of the covenant" (Mark 14:24; so also in Matt. 26:28), it is the *new* covenant in Luke 22:20 and I Cor. 11:25. The emphasis on the covenant's newness, as distinct from the old dispensation, is not out of harmony with Jesus' teaching about the new and the old (see, e.g., Mark 2:21 f.; Matt. 11:11–13 = Luke 7:28; 16:16), but the phrase or formula new *covenant* (which goes back to Jer. 31:31–34) forms a link between Luke and Paul. It was perhaps the watchword of both the Jerusalem and the Pauline churches.[3]

[2] Note that, as in Matt. 18:15–35, so for Paul excommunication is not to be permanent. There are, of course, no elaborate rules for excommunication such as one finds in 1QS.

[3] This indeed may throw light on the often discussed question of the longer reading in Luke 22:19b–20, supported by most authorities with the exception of D, the Old Latin, and the Curetonian Syriac. The connections of Luke-Acts with the Qumran thought world on the one side, and with Paul on the other, add to the

By the time when Paul wrote Second Corinthians, the New Covenant was an important feature of his preaching. Only in the Epistle to the Hebrews is it more prominent. But Paul's interpretation of the phrase is different from anything that went before and is stamped with his individuality. The New Covenant is not based on the letter but on the Spirit (II Cor. 3:6). When the Old Covenant is read the hearers in the synagogue still have the veil over their faces (3:15). Here Paul might well have had in mind even those who, like the Essenes and the Jerusalem church, boasted of belonging to a New Covenant. For the truly new covenant leads not to condemnation but to δικαιοσύνη — the justification or the righteousness of the believer. That is, it essentially consists not of a written code (διαθήκη, agreement or instrument) but in the Spirit, and where the Spirit of the Lord is there is liberty and with it an unveiled face and complete transformation (3:15–18) — in fact, a new creation (5:17).

It is in line with this that he rejects the very matters that are central in the interests of the Qumran sect — rules about food and drink, feasts, new moons and sabbaths, and asceticism (Col. 2:16–23, a passage that could have been written against the Essenes, though here Paul includes service of angels, whereas the newly discovered literature does not mention angels).

The concept of the new, as contrasted with the old, bulks larger in Paul's teaching than in that of Jesus. This is not surprising. Although Jesus proclaimed a new thing in the world and his mission to sinners as the inauguration of it, his attention was not concentrated upon himself. To Paul, looking back, the figure of Christ was all-important; it was he and not anyone else through whom the Covenant was established; and it was accomplished through the Cross, the supreme example of his love and self-giving. The Pauline concept of the New Covenant derives directly from Jeremiah and from Paul's meditation on the work of Jesus; it need not have been suggested to him by any Jewish sectarian documents.

In reinforcing his idea, Paul uses allegorical or midrashic inter-

---

probability that the longer reading is genuinely Lucan. The covenant idea is not particularly prominent in Luke-Acts but the word is used in Luke 1:72; Acts 3:25; 7:8, and the idea, in the broad sense, underlies Stephen's speech.

pretation of Old Testament passages; his general method is like that of the Manual of Discipline and the Habakkuk Midrash. But there is one significant difference. The Qumran writers concentrate on the prophets, particularly Isaiah, in finding hidden meanings applicable to their own times. Paul, in working out his basic ideas, draws a large proportion of his illustrations and arguments from the Pentateuch. Of course he often quotes from the prophets and the Psalms also, but law, atonement, sacrifice and judgment are his main problems and the stuff of his thought. In this he is closer to the Pharisees and the main stream of Judaism than are the new Qumran documents.

Paul's approach to religious literature is not essentially esoteric. To be sure he speaks of the wisdom of God as a mystery (I Cor. 2:7) but it is only because in the past it has been mysterious and because the wise of the world, whether Jews or Greeks, can make nothing of it. Israel's rejection of the gospel leads both Paul and the evangelists to suppose that unbelievers have been blinded and baffled by the revelation. There is, of course, one interesting parallel. 1QS 11:6 speaks of beholding a wisdom which was hidden from men of knowledge and a prudent purpose hidden from the sons of men (cf. also Brownlee's reading of 11:3 f.). One immediately thinks of I Cor. 1:18–2:16, particularly 2:9. In both cases the wisdom has been made known to the new community; the difference is that Christians did not, so far as we know, keep any of their teaching secret. In all probability both Paul and 1QS draw the idea from Isa. 64:3 (cf. also Matt. 13:10 f.=Luke 10:23 f.).

The most important parallels are confined to Columns 10 and 11 in the Manual and have to do with the concepts of righteousness and justification. They form a background for Pauline teaching and show that Paul was by no means the only person in this period who was concerned with the problems raised by these ideas.

In the Pauline letters God's righteousness is seen first in his wrath and second in his vindication of sinners who believe. In the LXX, δικαιοσύνη almost always represents ṣedeḳ or ṣᵉdaḳah, though in a few instances ḥesed, 'emeth and other words lie behind. Several times "righteousness" and "salvation" are in parallelism, e.g., Isa. 45:21–25; 46:13; 51:1, 5 f.; Ps. 98:2. "Blessing"

and "righteousness" are parallel in Ps. 24:5.[4] Likewise the verb δικαιόω represents the ṣdḳ root in practically every instance; e.g., Isa. 45:25, "In the Lord shall all the seed of Israel be justified (ἀπὸ Κυρίου δικαιωθήσονται) and shall glory."

The Manual of Discipline has much to say about God's vindicating righteousness, and, while the ideas are no doubt ultimately drawn from the Book of Isaiah, the noun mišpaṭ and verb špṭ are used more commonly for this purpose. In the LXX, of course, the usual translation of mišpaṭ is κρίμα or κρίσις. What this seems to mean is that in 1QS God's mišpaṭ is practically equated with his ṣedaḳah.

The main ideas are as follows:

1. God's mišpaṭ teaches and corrects. "I will choose what he teaches me and I will be content however he judges me. . . In his hand is the mišpaṭ of every living thing and all his deeds are 'emeth" (10:13, 16 f.). Man's way is not his own, he does not direct his own steps, for to God belongs the mišpaṭ and his counsel (mîd) is perfection of way. This use of mišpaṭ recalls the δικαίωμα of the Law in Rom. 8:4.[5]

2. Lying behind this is a strong conviction of the weakness and sinfulness of human nature. The dualism of 1QS has often been remarked; [6] it is at least as thoroughgoing as the Pauline and it belongs to the same strain of thought as IV Ezra 7:116–126; 8:34 f. But this dualism has been naturalized into Judaism; and, although mankind is divided into two camps it is possible to pass out of darkness into light. The author of 1QS confesses that he belongs to wicked mankind and to the assembly of perverse flesh (sôd basar, 11:9; cf. 11:7). "Flesh" is used, as in Paul, for the seat of wickedness, and the "assembly of flesh" is in contrast to the new and righteous sôd or 'eṣah. But even to one who belongs to the fleshly group there comes the offer of repentance and the moral imperative. One should note — and this is of supreme importance — that the change of man's nature is not in the ontological but in the moral realm. There is no reason to think that the

[4] Ṣedaḳah is used of the saving act of God and his fidelity to the Covenant in Jer. 50:7; Isa. 41:2, 10; 42:6; 45:8; 51:5.

[5] δικαίωμα in the LXX represents ḥoḳ 48 times and mišpaṭ 38 times.

[6] A. Dupont-Sommer, The Jewish Sect of Qumran and the Essenes (London, 1954), pp. 118–30.

sectaries regarded the physical body as hopelessly corrupt, though if they were Essenes they were, like Paul, suspicious of the sexual life and no doubt regarded it as the realm where temptation to sin supremely takes place. Burton's famous analysis of *σάρξ* in Paul is probably correct. The Apostle did not need to derive his ideas from Hellenistic sources; they were already present in Judaism.

3. God's mišpaṭ is in fact that which saves the sinner. The important passage reads as follows:

> In his compassion (rḥm) he has brought me near (hgyšny)
> And in his ḥesed he will bring my mišpaṭ.
> In his steadfast righteousness (ṣdḳt 'mtw) he has vindicated me (špṭny)
> And in his great goodness he will cover (atone for, ykpr) all my iniquities
> And in his righteousness (ṣdqtw) he will cleanse me from human impurity
> And from the sin of the sons of men (11:13–15).

It would be a mistake to work an exact theological system out of this passage, which is a poetic rhapsody, not a statement in precise legal language. Nevertheless there is a clear progression: bring near, justify, atone, cleanse. One recalls Paul's progression in Rom. 8:30,

> οὓς δὲ *προώρισεν, τούτους καὶ ἐκάλεσεν·*
> *καὶ οὓς ἐκάλεσεν, τούτους καὶ ἐδικαίωσεν·*
> *οὓς δὲ ἐδικαίωσεν, τούτους καὶ ἐδόξασεν·*

The idea of God bringing the believer near suggests Rom. 5:1 f., "Being justified, then, by faith let us have [or, we have] peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom also we have access (*τὴν προσαγωγήν*) to the grace in which we stand, and let us have confidence in hope of the glory of God." In 5:11 the similar word *καταλλαγή* or reconciliation is used; this the believer has received. In II Cor. 5:17–19 *καταλλαγή* would seem to refer to the whole process of reconciliation.

It would be over-subtle to put too much weight on the tenses of špṭ, nevertheless in 1QS it is said that God will bring the believer's mišpaṭ and that he will vindicate him; perhaps the imperfect has an eschatological reference.

As one might expect, the ṣdḳ and špṭ roots are used in close relation; e.g., in 11:4 f. it is said that from the fount of God's righteousness flows his mišpaṭ; cf. 11:11 f. In general, δικαιοσύνη in Paul appears to correspond to ṣᵉdaḳah in 1QS, and δικαίωσις and δικαίωμα to mišpaṭ, except that in II Cor. 3:7–9 the ministry of δικαιοσύνη, as contrasted with κατάκρισις, seems to suggest mišpaṭ as used in 1QS.

Other parallelisms in Column 11 are interesting:

Lines 10 and 11 — mišpaṭ and counsel (mîd)
Line 12 — ḥesed and mišpaṭ
Line 12 — raḥam, ḥesed and 'emeth

4. God's righteousness, as manifested in vindication, leads to the complete salvation of the believer. Even future sins ("stumbling through the guilt of flesh," 11:12) cannot annul the divine decree; the believer's mišpaṭ will stand forever. To be sure, God may punish his servant, but he will draw his soul out of the pit and direct his steps (11:13), cover his sins and cleanse him from impurity (11:15).

It is, of course, well known that the verb δικαιόω is used in Luke-Acts much more than in the other gospels, but not in the specifically Pauline sense except possibly in Luke 18:14 and Acts 13:38 f., where it means "cleared" and apparently refers to ἄφεσις ἁμαρτιῶν, a non-Pauline phrase.[7] Here, as in other respects, the author of Luke-Acts may be in touch with a thought world like that of the Qumran sect. It is possible to suppose that Luke knows of the Pauline discussion of justification, but in the light of the Manual of Discipline by no means necessary.

With 1QS as a background it is interesting to turn to the famous question whether in Paul δικαιόω always means "to declare righteous" or "to deem righteous." Certainly there are passages in Paul where it seems imperceptibly to pass over into the idea of making righteous.[8] Here in 1QS špṭ does not mean "to make righteous," nor does the hif'il of ṣdḳ seem to be used in the sense of "to vindicate." Yet the process of justification here ends in making the sinner righteous.

[7] It is used in the sense "to ascribe righteousness" (to God or Wisdom) in Luke 7:29; 7:35 (=Matt. 11:19); "to prove oneself in the right," in Luke 10:29; 16:15.
[8] E.g., I Cor. 6:11.

In the past fifty years a number of scholars have wrestled with the problem that, while Pauline righteousness must be a "righteousness not mine own," and therefore one cannot boast of it, still it cannot be altogether fictitious. Goodspeed defends the translation "make righteous."[9] Rudolf Bultmann explains that the justified man is actually made righteous, but it is a forensic righteousness.[10] Dodd puts the emphasis on vindication but speaks also of the righteousness of a converted and forgiven man, and Vincent Taylor develops the idea further.[11] Long ago, J. H. Ropes made the suggestion that in Paul's thought the sinner is vindicated as against the sin which wrongfully oppresses him; as against his sins, which are his opponents in court, his is the righteous cause.[12] This last would seem to apply well both to the Pauline letters and to 1QS. Not only does God blot out the man's transgression and cover his sins but if sin appears against him God will vindicate him as he has done before.

All the ideas expressed in the passages of 1QS which we have quoted above refer to a single process of conversion. On God's side it is an act of prevenient grace which rescues the sinner, sets him right, cleanses and directs him; on man's side it is an act of obedience, acceptance and thanksgiving.

In Pauline terminology, can this be described as a justification through works of the Law? At first glance one is tempted to say so; but there is the same grace of God (raḥam, ḥesed, 'emeth) and the whole atmosphere is one of faith and trust, even though the sectarian writer does not speculate on his own faith and its value. This faith would appear to be placed in God and his action, rather than in a Messiah or Teacher of Righteousness. There is, of course, a faith or confidence in the Law and in the specific revelation brought by the sect. This leads us to the passage in

[9] E. J. Goodspeed, Problems of New Testament Translation (Chicago, 1945), pp. 143–46. Goodspeed cites Rom. 5:19; 6:4; II Cor. 5:21 in support of his argument.

[10] R. Bultmann, Theologie des neuen Testaments, Lfg. 1 (Tübingen, 1948), pp. 272–5.

[11] C. H. Dodd, The Epistle of Paul to the Romans (London, 1932), pp. 12 f., 51–53; The Meaning of Paul for To-day (London, 1920), p. 111; V. Taylor, Forgiveness and Reconciliation (London, 1941), pp. 62–72.

[12] J. H. Ropes, "'Righteousness' and 'The Righteousness of God' in the Old Testament and St. Paul," Journal of Biblical Literature, XXII (1903), 211–27. Professor W. H. P. Hatch called my attention to this article some years ago.

the Habakkuk Midrash (8:1 f.) commenting on the famous text Hab. 2:4. "Its interpretation concerns all who fulfill the Law in the house of Judah and whom God will rescue out of the house of judgment on account of their affliction and their fidelity to the Teacher of Righteousness." [13]

Should we go further, with Dupont-Sommer and others and translate "their *faith in* the Teacher of Righteousness"? It is tempting to do so and thereby establish a still closer parallel to Paul. But "fidelity" is the most natural way to render the word in Habakkuk and in the Manual of Discipline. The Teacher is not yet an object of faith except that he may be the coming Messiah. In any case, however, the passage is most significant because it shows that Paul's famous text has already been used to refer to a believer's relationship to an historic Teacher, perhaps a Messiah.

How startling it is that a narrow and harsh law book ends on such a note of hope and justification. The explanation is, of course, that the book is written by religious Jews who spend their time expounding the Old Testament. The new materials show, furthermore, that the issue of justification and the means whereby God accepts the sinner, are not creations of Paul's brain, above all not *ad hoc* creations for occasional sermons to the Galatians and Romans, but real issues about which people were concerned, at least in sectarian circles. Discussion must have been widespread; nothing suggests that Paul had ever known or read the Manual of Discipline. This is one more indication that the Apostle, however individual and creative he was, is a child of Judaism. Judaism furnishes his presuppositions, the framework of his thought, and the materials of his thinking. How far he went beyond the type of thinking found in 1QS is to be accounted for from his own personality and the impact of Jesus upon him.

[13] A. Dupont-Sommer, op. cit., pp. 55 f. The latest piece of evidence on the messianism of the sect is the psalm 1QH6 published by J. V. Chamberlain, "Another Qumran Thanksgiving Psalm," Journal of Near Eastern Studies, XIV (1955), 32–41. Cf. also the fragment of the Micah midrash, which speaks of "tous ceux qui s'offrent pour être agrégés aux élus de [Dieu, pratiquant la Loi] dans le Concile de la communauté, qui seront sauvés du jour [du jugement]"; tr. by J. T. Milik, "Fragments d'un Midrash de Michée dans les manuscrits de Qumran," Revue Biblique, LIX (1952), 412–18.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

https://archive.org/details/harvard-theological-review_1955-07_48_3

WHICH WAS WRITTEN FIRST, LUKE OR ACTS?

HENRY G. RUSSELL
SWARTHMORE, PENNSYLVANIA

NEW TESTAMENT scholars have almost universally assumed that Luke was written before Acts. The evidence to support this assumption is not great, and the possibility that these two books might have been written in the reverse order should also be considered. The clearest and perhaps the only evidence for the priority of Luke to Acts is to be found in Acts 1:1, where the author speaks of a "first book" which he has written, and then describes it in terms which show that he is referring to the Gospel of Luke. To this might perhaps be added the evidence of Luke 1:1–4, where the author is almost certainly giving us a preface not only to the Gospel but to Acts as well.[1] But as Cadbury has indicated, Luke 1:1–4 may have been written after Acts had already been completed,[2] so that this General Preface does not really give us substantial evidence for the priority of Luke. And although the secondary preface in Acts 1:1 is explicit enough about the priority of Luke, there is the possibility that it too may have been written only after the main body of both Luke and Acts had been completed. The editors of The Beginnings of Christianity, vol. V, p. 350, say, "Prefaces then, as now, were probably written after the work was completed. . . ." This comment was made with special reference to the preface to Luke, but it might apply equally to the preface to Acts. These two prefaces do show that Luke and Acts are two parts of one work, but neither of them offers any sure clue as to which part was written first.

The traditional view of Luke's priority to Acts is probably based, however, not so much on the evidence of Acts 1:1 as on the general assumption that what an author presents first he has written first, that chapter one was written before chapter two,

[1] Henry J. Cadbury in The Beginnings of Christianity (London, 1920–1933), vol. II, p. 492 and p. 136. See also articles by Cadbury in the Expositor for June 1921, p. 439, and for December 1922, pp. 414 and 418.

[2] Beginnings of Christianity, vol. II, p. 492.

volume one before volume two. How safe an assumption this is to make will depend entirely on the habits of workmanship of the individual author, the materials with which he is dealing, the type of literature he is producing. For a modern writer at least there would be nothing unusual about sketching out the plan for a whole work and then proceeding to write the last part first and the first part last. We are told, for example, that this is what Soren Kierkegaard did when he wrote Either/Or and Training in Christianity.[3]

Whether an ancient author would be likely to follow this procedure is hard to say, but the possibility cannot be ruled out. If the author of Luke-Acts could put first the preface which he had actually written last, he could also put first a whole volume which he had written last. In The Making of Luke-Acts Cadbury has pointed out that it was the custom of ancient historians to begin with history that had already been worked over by earlier writers and then to continue with later and newer materials from more recent times, and he suggests that the author of Luke-Acts is following this custom.[4] We may readily agree with this suggestion, but still point out that it perhaps tells us more about how the author planned his work than about how he composed it. He may well have planned it in the order Luke-Acts, but written it in the order Acts-Luke.

Now to suggest this possibility is not necessarily to urge its probability. Perhaps we simply do not have the evidence on which to base a firm judgment either way. But to say this is at least to emphasize that the traditional view of Luke's priority is after all an assumption, not a proven fact, an assumption moreover which so far as I know has never been adequately tested or criticized.

The results of the easy reliance on this assumption can be seen in the way a number of scholars have gone about the problem of dating Luke-Acts. One group, impressed by the evidence for an early date for Acts, have on the assumption of Luke's priority been led to assign a still earlier date for Luke. Another group,

[3] See note by Walter Lowrie in A Kierkegaard Anthology, edited by Robert Bretall (Princeton, 1946), p. 413.

[4] Henry Cadbury, The Making of Luke-Acts (New York, 1927), p. 332.

impressed by the evidence for a late date for Luke, have on the same assumption been led to assign a still later date to Acts. Godet, for example, arguing from an early date for Acts to an earlier date for Luke says, "The book of Acts, certainly written after the Gospel, does not seem to have been composed after the destruction of Jerusalem." [5] And then, commenting on Paul's unfinished career at the end of Acts, Godet says, "The Acts must therefore have been written in the interval between the end of Paul's first captivity at Rome (in the spring of the year 64) and his martyrdom (about 67). The Gospel must have been composed a short time before." [6] Moffatt, on the other hand, arguing from a later date for Luke to a still later date for Acts, says "As Acts is a sequel to the third gospel, and as the latter was written after A.D. 70, the *terminus a quo* for the composition of the δεύτερος λόγος is determined without further ado." [7] In both these cases, and in all the others for which they stand as examples, a common pattern emerges. There is first the underlying assumption of Luke's priority, and then based upon it there is the use of evidence in one book to assign a date to the other.

Perhaps the most striking example of this tendency to let the assumption of Luke's priority become a controlling factor in the dating of Luke-Acts can be seen in the way Harnack handled the problem at different stages in his career. In 1897, in his Chronologie der altchristlichen Litteratur, vol. I, pp. 246–250, Harnack was primarily impressed by the evidence for a post-70 A.D. date for Luke, and was thus led to argue for a post-70 A.D. date for Acts also. By 1911, however, in his Date of the Acts and the Synoptic Gospels, pp. 90–135, Harnack felt that the evidence in Acts for a date prior to 70 A.D. was decisive. This of course meant, on the assumption of Luke's priority, that Luke too was written before 70 A.D., so Harnack was now forced to try to minimize or explain away all the evidence in Luke which had originally led him to give it a date after 70 A.D. Evidently the thought never occurred to him that he might have been half right and half wrong both in 1897 and again in 1911 — right in being

[5] F. Godet, A Commentary on the Gospel of St. Luke (New York, 1887), p. 544.
[6] Op. cit. p. 545.
[7] James Moffatt, An Introduction to the Literature of the New Testament (New York, 1917), p. 311.

impressed in 1897 by the evidence for a late date for Luke, right again in 1911 in being impressed by the evidence for an early date for Acts, but wrong both times in assuming without question the priority of Luke.

Only three persons so far as I know have heretofore suggested that Acts might have been written before Luke. Back in 1905 Bishop F. H. Chase theorized that the author of Luke-Acts first wrote only the story of Paul's apostleship, and that he then twice enlarged this original work, first to include the story of the other apostles, and finally in a second volume to include the story of Jesus.[8] More recently C. S. C. Williams has suggested the possibility of Acts' priority to Luke. In a book review of his appearing in The Journal of Theological Studies for 1948, p. 204, he says "Acts may have been written after a compilation of Q and L material and before the third Gospel as we have it." Four or five years later he repeats this suggestion in his revision of A. H. McNeile's An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament (Oxford, 1953), pp. 34 and 41. In the end, however, Williams seems to favor the conventional order, giving 80–85 as a probable date for Luke and 90 for Acts.[9] It should be pointed out that this may be a repetition of McNeile's opinion rather than Williams' own judgment.[10] Finally, still more recently, Roland Koh has also suggested that Acts was composed before Luke, and like Williams has based his suggestion on the Proto-Luke theory of Streeter and Taylor.[11] Koh suggests that the "former treatise" mentioned in Acts 1:1 refers not to our present Luke but to Proto-Luke, that this Proto-Luke was composed in 58–60, and that it was followed by Acts in 63 and by our present Luke in 71–75.[12]

Let us now see what considerations there are which might support the possibility of Acts' priority to Luke. The internal chronological evidence of the two documents, while neither extensive nor decisive, seems to suggest a date after 70 A.D. for

[8] F. H. Chase, "The Gospels in the Light of Historical Criticism" in Cambridge Theological Essays, edited by H. B. Swete (London, 1905), pp. 380–381.

[9] Williams, op. cit. p. 37.

[10] Cf. A. H. McNeile, An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament, first edition (Oxford, 1927), p. 36.

[11] Roland Koh, The Writings of St. Luke (Hongkong, 1953), pp. 23–35.

[12] Koh, op. cit. pp. 31–34.

Luke and before 70 A.D. for Acts. The judgment of a post-70 A.D. date for Luke is based primarily on the description of the destruction of Jerusalem given in Luke 19:41–44, and more especially in 21:20–24, which when compared with the vaguer language of the parallel account in Mark 13:14–19 looks like a phophecy after the event.[13] This judgment of a post-70 A.D. date is supported, although not necessarily confirmed, by the almost certain fact that Luke is dependent on Mark and hence later than Mark. To this evidence for a date after 70 A.D. may be added the fact that there is no internal evidence pointing surely to a date before 70 A.D.

The judgment of a pre-70 A.D. date for Acts is based primarily on the abrupt ending of Acts, with Paul still awaiting trial (60–62 A.D.), and on the fact that no mention is made of the destruction of Jerusalem, where we might naturally expect such mention if Acts had been written after 70 A.D. The theory that the author of Luke-Acts planned a third book would explain the abrupt ending of Acts, but would still not be incompatible with the possibility that Acts was written before 70 A.D., and it would tell us nothing either way about the order in which Luke and Acts were composed.[14] The judgment of a date before 70 A.D. is supported, although again not necessarily confirmed, by the author's apparent ignorance of a collection of Paul's letters.[15] To this evidence for a date before 70 A.D. can be added the fact that there is no clear internal evidence for a date after 70 A.D. The view that the author of Luke-Acts was dependent on Josephus' Antiquities,

[13] For a recent assertion of the view that Luke 19:41–44 and 21:20–24 are genuine forecasts and hence prior to 70 A.D., see C. H. Dodd, "The Fall of Jerusalem and the 'Abomination of Desolation'" in The Journal of Roman Studies, vol. 37 (1947), pp. 47–54.

[14] For the theory of a third volume see Theodor Zahn, Introduction to the New Testament (New York, 1909), vol. III, pp. 56–61. For a discussion of this theory see Beginnings of Christianity, vol. IV, pp. 2 and 349, and vol. V, pp. 336–338. For a recent discussion of the abrupt ending of Acts see Lindsey P. Pherigo, "Paul's Life after the Close of Acts," Journal of Biblical Literature, vol. 70 (1951), pp. 277–284.

[15] For the suggestion that the author of Luke-Acts may have known Paul's letters but made little or no use of them, see Kirsopp Lake, Beginnings of Christianity, vol. V, pp. 238–239. For the view that the author of Luke-Acts did not know Paul's letters see H. Windisch, Beginnings of Christianity, vol. II, pp. 308–309. For the suggestion that Luke-Acts was the stimulus for the collection and publication of Paul's letters see Edgar J. Goodspeed, New Solutions of New Testament Problems (Chicago, 1927), pp. 1–10.

which was written about 93 A.D., would if proved be fatal to the possibility that Acts was written before 70 A.D. But scholars are not at all agreed about this theory, and even if it could be proved it still would tell us nothing either way about the order in which Luke and Acts were composed.[16] Arthur Nock has recently made the point that Acts would probably not have been written "while the Second Coming of Jesus seemed imminent," thus suggesting I take it a date nearer the 80's than the 60's.[17] But here again this would still tell us nothing either way about which of the two volumes was written first.

A second point in support of the possibility that Acts was written before Luke has to do with the problem of the Ascension story. The two accounts of the Ascension given at the end of Luke and the beginning of Acts are not entirely consistent, the account in Luke 24:50–53 appearing to be an imperfect secondary summary of a longer primary account in Acts 1. Kirsopp Lake tried to resolve this difficulty by suggesting that Luke 24:50–53 was added after Luke-Acts had been separated, to summarize the account in Acts 1 and to bring the Gospel to a rounded conclusion.[18] The important point for us to notice is that we seem to get the primary version in Acts and the secondary and derivative version in Luke, and that this relationship could be explained at least as easily on the view of Acts' priority to Luke as on the view that Luke 24:50–53 was added at a later date after both books had been written.

A third possible clue is to be found in the relation between Acts 7:59–60, giving Stephen's last words at the time of his martyrdom, and Luke 23:34, 46, giving Jesus' words on the cross. The editors of The Beginnings of Christianity, vol. IV, p. 85, in commenting on this relationship suggest that the story of the Passion in Luke may at this point have been influenced by the

[16] For the theory of Luke-Acts' dependence on Josephus see F. C. Burkitt, The Gospel History and its Transmission (Edinburgh, 1906), pp. 105–110. For a discussion of the theory see Beginnings of Christianity, vol. II, pp. 355–359.

[17] A. D. Nock in a review of Martin Dibelius, Aufsätze zur Apostelgeschichte, in Gnomon, 1953, vol. 25, no. 8, p. 503.

[18] Beginnings of Christianity, vol. V, pp. 3–4. For other discussions of this problem see B. H. Streeter, The Four Gospels (New York, 1925), pp. 142–143, and M. S. Enslin, "The Ascension Story," Journal of Biblical Literature, vol. 47 (1928), pp. 60–73.

story of Stephen in Acts. That there is a relationship between these two passages is obvious, but which way the influence runs — from Acts to Luke, or Luke to Acts — is not so clear, so that all we can safely say about it is that it does not contradict the view of Acts' priority and would indeed fit in well with such a view. I have thought that there might be a similar relationship between Paul's apparently miraculous escape from mob violence at Lystra (Acts 14:19–20) and Jesus' somewhat parallel experience at Nazareth (Luke 4:28–30), which does not occur in either of the other two synoptic gospels.

A similar clue may perhaps be found in the parallel treatment of Jesus' career in Luke and Paul's career in Acts. Henry Cadbury has conjectured "that the arrangement in Luke's gospel of Jesus' prolonged progression to Jerusalem and death has been affected by the geographical character of Paul's career, particularly by the latter's ominous approach to Jerusalem and his often anticipated arrival at Rome." [19] This would not necessarily imply that Acts had been written before Luke, but it would seem to imply that at least the proposed outline of Acts was in the author's mind while he was writing Luke, and in any event it would be completely compatible with the possibility that Acts was written first.

Finally we may have another similar clue in the fact that a motif in Mark is occasionally missing from the parallel account in Luke, only to be found again in Acts.[20] In commenting on the first of these instances the editors of The Beginnings of Christianity, vol. IV, p. 8, ask whether the author omitted Mark 13:32 from the Lucan parallel because he was already planning to use it in Acts 1:7. The implication here is that not only the plan but even some of the detailed contents of Acts were already in the author's mind while he was writing Luke. And this leads naturally to the further possibility that Acts might actually have been written before Luke, for an author would be even more likely to omit what he had already used than what he was merely planning to use. At any rate we seem to have here as elsewhere examples of

[19] The Making of Luke-Acts, pp. 231–232.

[20] Mark 13:32-Acts 1:7; Mark 14:56-Acts 6:11; Mark 14:58-Acts 6:14; Mark 5:40-Acts 9:40; Mark 14:2-Acts 12:4.

the influence of Acts on the composition and arrangement of Luke.

The study of almost all New Testament problems, and especially those dealing with chronology, is beset with so many uncertainties that it is almost impossible to speak with finality on any of them. My intention in discussing the possibility of Acts' priority to Luke has not been to try to prove its probability, but rather by offering it as a possibility to question the validity of the alternative and traditional view. The priority of Luke to Acts is a justifiable assumption as far as it goes, but it is not the only possibility, and until evidence stronger than that of Acts 1:1 is brought to its support, it should not be treated like a proven fact nor should it be made to bear the weight of other and more important judgments about the relation of Luke and Acts to each other and about their place in the history of early Christianity.

ALCUIN ON VIRTUES AND VICES

A Manual for a Carolingian Soldier

LUITPOLD WALLACH
Cornell University

Dedicated to Professor James Hutton

The work of the Northumbrian Alcuin in the service of Charlemagne by far excels in importance the contributions of other scholars allied with the Frankish king.[1] One of Alcuin's many interests was to develop in the leaders among the laity of a barbarian age [2] a sense of moral responsibility and a personal culture fit for the commanding positions which these men held. Many of the letters sent by Alcuin [3] to Charlemagne and other members of the Royal household, to the kings of Mercia and Northumbria, to Frankish and British nobles and government officials, overflow with advice and requests to mend their ways. With this aim he wrote special works for some of these persons — for one example, the Rhetoric [4] as a Via Regia for Charlemagne, a work which must be classed [5] as the oldest Carolingian *speculum principis*,[6] preceding that of Smaragdus of St. Mihiel (written for Louis the Pious), that of Jonas of Orléans (for Pippin of Aquitania), that of Sedulius Scotus (for Lothar II), and that of Hincmar of Reims (for Charles the Bald). Related to these *specula* is the treatise De virtutibus et

[1] See Luitpold Wallach, 'Charlemagne and Alcuin: Diplomatic Studies in Carolingian Epistolography,' Traditio 9 (1953), 127–154.

[2] Cf. the censure of barbarian procedures of law by Alcuin's friend, Theodulph of Orléans, as described by P. M. Arcari, 'Un goto critico della legislazioni barbariche,' Archivio Storico Italiano 110 (1952), 3–37; some of Arcari's interpretations of the Lex Salica are, however, mistaken.

[3] Edited by Ernst Dümmler, MGH, Epistolae IV (1895).

[4] This thesis will be developed in a forthcoming monograph 'The Via Regia of Charlemagne: Studies in Carolingian History.'

[5] Heinz Löwe in Wattenbach-Levison, Deutschlands Geschichtsquellen im Mittelalter (Weimar, 1953), 230, note 211, and p. 233, accepts in principle our interpretation of the Rhetoric as a *speculum principis*, as suggested in Speculum 24 (1949), 588 f.

[6] Cf. Lester Born, 'The Specula Principis of the Carolingian Renaissance,' Revue belge de philologie et d'histoire 12 (1933), 483–612, who lists neither the Rhetoric nor De virtutibus et vitiis among the Carolingian *specula*.

vitiis,[7] which Alcuin wrote in the year 799 or 800 for Wido, Margrave of the Marca Britanniae, who during the same years overcame the resistance of this territory to Charlemagne. In type this ethical manual resembles the Libellus exhortatorius,[8] compiled between 796 and 799 by Alcuin's friend Paulinus of Aquileia for Duke Eric of Friuli, one of Charlemagne's best generals. We recall also the Liber manualis of Dhuoda,[9] wife of Bernard of Septimania, written between 841 and 843 for her son William, who was then attached, probably as a page, to the Court of Charles the Bald. An analysis of the contents, purpose, philosophy, and literary composition of Alcuin's treatise should reveal the author's way of thinking and his method of writing, and enable us to assess the historical significance of the tractate.

De Virtutibus Et Vitiis

The treatise [10] of 35 chapters may be divided into four parts distinct in style and content. A dedicatory letter opens the treatise, and a brief epistolary peroration (ch. 36) brings it to a close.[11] The first 26 chapters deal with the following topics: wisdom, faith, charity, hope, the reading of the Bible Lesson, peace, mercy, forgiveness, patience, humility, remorse, confession, repentance, the return to God, the fear of God, fasting, alms-giving, chastity, freedom from conceit, on judges, bearing false witness, envy, pride, wrath, deceit, and perseverance in good works. Chapters 27–34 provide a catalogue of 8 principal vices. The last chapter, 35, is a disquisition on the four cardinal virtues: wisdom, justice, courage, and temperance, which, together with the term 'virtus,' are defined and described. The division into 35 chapters is confirmed by the title, dating from the ninth century, found in the catalogue of the library at St. Gall: 'Alchvvini ad Vitonem comitem capitula

[7] Migne, PL 101, 613–638.

[8] Migne, PL 99, 197 ff.; Dom Rochais lists in the Revue Bénédictine 63 (1953), 251 the extant MSS of this treatise.

[9] Ed. E. Bondurand, Le Manuel de Dhuoda (Paris, 1887); see the fine study by A. Burger, 'Les vers de la Duchesse Dhuoda et son poème De temporibus suis,' Mélanges J. Marouzeau (Paris, 1948), 85–102.

[10] Ch. 36, PL 101, 638B–C, is not an original chapter of the treatise; see below note 12.

[11] The introductory letter and the peroration are critically edited by Dümmler, MGH, Epistolae IV, Epist. 305, p.464 f.

xxxv.'[12] The letter-peroration (chapter 36 in Migne) was therefore not counted by Alcuin as a separate chapter.

The four parts of the treatise are obviously composed in different styles. The epistolary sections conform to the personal style of Alcuin, as known from his many epistles. But while the section on virtues is written in a homiletic vein, that on the *vitia* is factual and descriptive. And Chapter 35 contains elements of both styles. That this variety results from Alcuin's use of different sources (see below) is clear.

Alcuin allegedly wrote upon the express request of the recipient. Wido, busily absorbed *in bellicis rebus*, receives a handbook (*manualis libellus*) which is to tell him what to do and what to avoid in his daily life.

The treatise is presented as a *breviarium*,[13] composed, as expected, *brevi sermone*. *Breviarium* is also the term used for the Officia per Ferias; it was intended to teach a 'homo laicus, qui adhuc in vita activa consistit,' how to pray and make the best use of his time.[14] The layman Wido is not to be perturbed; his military profession will not prevent him from entering the Portals of Heaven. Heaven is open to all without distinction of sex or age or station in life, if only they perform good works (cf. Gal. 3,28; Coloss. 3,11).

Alcuin's purpose in writing can be deduced from certain topics used in the introductory letter and the peroration. His initial allegation that he wrote upon Wido's request cannot be taken seriously, since this is one of the many topics of modesty in his arsenal of rhetorical over- and understatements so abundantly drawn upon in his writings. Further, the pretence of writing upon request is supposed to lend authority to the work of the author.[15] Like commonplaces also occur, for example, in the dedicatory epistle addressed to Beornrad of Sens which accompanies Alcuin's Vita S. Willibrordi: that Alcuin has, upon request of the recipient

[12] Paul Lehmann, Mittelalterliche Bibliothekskataloge I (Munich, 1918), 79.

[13] Letter and peroration are always referred to in Dümmler's edition.

[14] MGH, Epistolae IV, Epist. 304, p.462,30. A. Wilmart, Revue Bénédictine 48 (1936), 262 f. assumes that this collection of prayers is of post-Alcuinian origin; also F. X. Haimerl, Mittelalterliche Frömmigkeit im Spiegel der Gebetbuchliteratur Süddeutschlands (Munich, 1952), p.6.

[15] E. R. Curtius, European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages (Bollingen Series 36, New York, 1953), 85.

(*petitioni*), written that the style of the work is not an eminent example of eloquence (*eloquentia*), and that it is *caritas* which has spurred the author to write. Let us compare these passages: Alcuin writes to Wido (MGH, Epistolae IV, p. 464, no. 305):

Cui tam honestae *petitioni* libenter me annuere fateor, optans meae devotionis apices tibi ad perpetuam proficere salutem. Quos etiam, quamvis minus *eloquenter* videantur esse compositi, tamen certissime scito sanctae *caritatis* vigore eosdem esse dictatos.

Alcuin writes to Beornrad of Sens (MGH, Epistolae IV, p. 175, no. 120):

Sed tamen longe imparem me *petitioni* vestrae consideravi, utpote nullo praerogativae munere *eloquentiae* suffultus, ad implendum quod iussisti; ac nisi me *caritas* urgeret, quae nulla negare solet, non auderem ultra meae paupertatis vires negotium attingere.

Other matters in Alcuin's letter are the same as those he uses in epistles to high-ranking clerics recommending that they read the Cura Pastoralis of Gregory the Great, which Alcuin calls a *speculum* [16] of pontifical life.

The main topics employed in the letter to Wido are as follows:

a. Read the treatise frequently,[17] so that
b. your mind, wearied by outward vexations, may have something to turn to in which it can take pleasure; [18]
c. memorize individual chapters of the treatise; [19]
d. the work is a handbook which teaches you what to avoid and what to do.[20]

[16] Epist. 116, p.171,27 (Dümmler): 'Speculum est enim pontificalis vitae et medicina contra singula diabolicae fraudis vulnera,' a reference overlooked by R. Bradley, 'Backgrounds of the title *Speculum* in mediaeval literature,' Speculum 29 (1953), 100–103. On *speculum* as book-title see Paul Lehmann, Mittelalterliche Büchertitel (SB. Bayer. Akademie der Wiss., 1953, Heft 3), pp. 30–44.

[17] Epist. 305, p.464,24: '. . . litterulas, ita te humiliter deposco, ut easdem saepius legere digneris.'

[18] Ibidem, p.464,22: '. . . ; ut animus exterioribus fatigatus molestiis, ad se ipsum reversus habeat, in quo gaudeat.'

[19] Ibidem, p.464,19: '. . . memoriae haec mea dicta inhaerere.'

[20] Ibidem, p.464,31: '. . . ; ut habeas cotidie quasi manualem in conspectu tuo libellum, in quo possis te ipsum considerare, quid cavere, vel quid agere debeas.' This passage is modeled after Alcuin, ch. 5, De lect. studio (PL 101, 616C): 'Sanctarum lectio Scripturarum divinae cognitio beatitudinis. In his enim quasi in quodam *speculo* homo seipsum considerare potest, qualis sit, vel quo tendat.'

The same commonplaces occur also in letters addressed by Alcuin, approximately between 793 and 797, to Eanbald II, archbishop of York (Ep. 116); to Arno of Salzburg (Ep. 113), to Higbald of Lindisfarne (Ep. 124); and to an unknown ecclesiastic (Ep. 39). We again find the topics *a-d* in the following letters:

a and *d* in Epist. 116, p. 171, 25: 'Sepius illum (scil. Liber S. Gregorii Pastoralis) legas et relegas, quatenus te ipsum et tuum opus cognoscas in illo; ut, qualiter vivere vel docere debeas, ante oculos habeas;'

a, *b*, and *c*, in Epist. 113, p. 166, 12: '. . . ut illum (see above) saepius quasi enchiridion habeas in manibus et in corde reteneas . . . sanctorum doctorum scio libros habere legere et firma tenere memoria;'

a, *c*, and *d*, in Epist. 124, p. 182, 30: 'Iste liber (see above) tuis saepius inhereat manibus, illius sensus tuae firmiter infigantur memoriae; ut scias, qualiter quisque . . . se ipsum circumspicere debeat; et quibus exemplis vivere necesse sit;'

a and *b*, in Epist. 39, p. 83, 2: 'Sed et pastoralem beati Gregorii papae saepissime perscrutare. His aepulis animam tuam pasce, ut habeas, unde alios quoque reficere valeas.'

The dedicatory Epistle is typical of Alcuin's style, and not indebted to the letter-preface of Defensor's Liber Scintillarum[21] for any of its topics.

Alcuin clearly saw his treatise De virtutibus et vitiis as something akin—*mutatis mutandis*—to Gregory's Pastoral Rule, and as a handbook to guide the soldier Wido in moral conflicts that might occur in the everyday affairs of a military man and royal judge. A letter of Alcuin (Epist. 249, p. 402, 5) addressed to Charlemagne praises Wido as 'a perfect man and incorruptible judge.' Obviously Alcuin's essay continues the Continental tradition of Gregory the Great, not a British tradition presented 'im insularen Raum'[22] by pseudo-Cyprian's treatise De duodecim abusivis saeculi.[23]

In philosophy the treatise is simple. Life is mirrored as a conflict between the virtues and the eight vices which are the root of

[21] Dom Rochais, Revue Bénédictine 63 (1953), 264 seems to assume such an influence.

[22] So Heinz Löwe in Wattenbach-Levison, op. cit., p.233.

[23] Ed. S. Hellmann in Texte und Untersuchungen ed. Harnack-Gebhardt, 34 (1910); Alcuin was familiar with ch. 10 on the Rex iniquus of this political treatise.

all evil. Thus Alcuin writes to a correspondent: 'Tu vero pacem cum omnibus habeas, *bellum cum vitiis*' (Epist. 209, p. 349, 10). The vices are overcome by their opposites among the virtues: pride is defeated by humility, gluttony by abstinence, fornication by chastity, avarice again by abstinence, anger by patience, sloth by good works, ungodly sorrow by spiritual pleasure, and vainglory by godly charity. In this battle of contraries, the virtues are victoriously led by the four cardinal virtues, the *duces gloriosissimi*, against the *duces impietatis* and their armies. All this reflects the traditional picture of the continuous battle waged between the virtues and the vices described by Prudentius in the Psychomachia, by Cassian in the Collationes and the Institutes and then by Gregory the Great, Moralia in Job, XXXI, 45. These authors are well-known to Alcuin, and so was the description of this battle in Aldhelm's De virginitate,[24] a model for Alcuin's metrical verse.

The preceding analysis shows that Alcuin only repeats traditional commonplaces. His reference to the content of the treatise as *haec mea dicta* (in the dedicatory letter) is therefore not to be taken literally or seriously. The expression *mea dicta* also occurs in other epistles, and belongs to the rhetorical style he employs in his letters.[25]

A critical investigation of the treatise will finally reveal how Alcuin excerpted from his sources.

The Sources of the Section De Virtutibus

Dom Rochais has recently published a study of the source said to underlie the first section of the treatise, which deals with the virtues.[26] He concludes that Alcuin used a *florilegium* of patristic authors and not their original writings. The intermediary is said to have been the Liber Scintillarum of Defensor of Ligugé,[27] who

[24] See the prose chaps. 11 and 12, and metr., vv.2454–72, ed. R. Ehwald, MGH, Auctores Antiquissimi 15 (1919).

[25] Cf. Epist. 257, p.415,24, addressed to Charlemagne, also Epist. 172, p.284,22.

[26] H.-M. Rochais, 'Le Liber de virtutibus et vitiis d'Alcuin: Note pour l'étude des sources,' Revue Mabillon 41 (1951), 77–86.

[27] Migne, PL 88, 597–718. See the studies of the Liber Scintillarum by Dom Rochais in Revue Bénédictine 58 (1948), 77–83; 59 (1949), 137–156; 61 (1951), 63–80; 'Les manuscrits du L. Sc.,' Scriptorium 4 (1950), 294–309. Furthermore A.

during the last decades of the seventh century compiled a collection of *deflorationes* from the Old and New Testaments and from early and later patristic writings. Defensor always indicates in his *catenae* the authors of the quotations without expressly registering the fact that many of these quotations are not directly derived from their originals but from later *florilegia*, such as Isidore of Seville's Synonyma and Sententiae. Dom Rochais believes that a similar method was also adopted by authors who used Defensor's work: they never mention Defensor's name. 'Une dépendance de ce genre apparaît dans le *Liber de virtutibus et vitiis* d'Alcuin: 130 passages de la Bible et des Pères sont communs aux deux florilèges, et la façon dont les cite Alcuin prouve qu'il les doit à Defensor.' [28] But these and other conclusions of Rochais in his inquiry are untenable. That Alcuin was familiar with Defensor's compilation has not been proved by Dom Rochais, despite his lists of passages in both works which are in complete textual agreement. For many sections of Alcuin's treatise whose sources are not listed by Rochais, the underlying source is easy to see. Dom Rochais gives a synopsis of the parallel passages [29] in the first 26 chapters of Alcuin's treatise *and* in Defensor, and also identifies the origin of Defensor's excerpts. Some parallels have escaped his attention. Besides those mentioned for various reasons in the course of our investigation, compare, for instance, the two following:

Alcuin, ch. 7, *De misericordia* (PL 101, 618B): 'in judice misericordia et disciplina debet esse, quia una sine altera bene esse non possit;'

Defensor, ch. 43, *De misericordia* (PL 88, 674C): 'Gregorius. Disciplina sine misericordia multum destituitur, si una sine altera teneatur.'

Alcuin, ch. 18, *De castitate* (627B): 'castitas hominem coelo conjungit;'

Vaccari, 'Il liber scintillarum del monaco Defensor,' Studi Medievali 17 (1951), 86–92. Not listed by S. de Ricci and W. J. Wilson, Census of Medieval and Renaissance Manuscripts in the United States, are two MSS of Defensor, currently offered for sale by the New York firm of Bernard M. Rosenthal, Inc.; see nos. 2 and 32 of their Catalogue I: Selections of Medieval Text Manuscripts (New York, 1954), pp. 2 and 21.

[28] Rochais, 'Contribution à l'histoire des florilèges ascétiques du Haut Moyen Age Latin: Le Liber Scintillarum,' Revue Bénédictine 63 (1953), 289.

[29] Revue Mabillon 41 (1951), 81–86. All subsequent references to Rochais are to this synopsis unless otherwise indicated.

Defensor, ch. 13, *De virginitate* (633A): 'Isidorus. Castitas hominem ad coelos conjungit:' = Isidore of Seville, Synonyma, II, 10 (PL 83, 847C): 'castitas hominem coelo jungit.'

Dom Rochais misjudges the relation between the Sententiae of Isidore of Seville and the quotations from this work in Alcuin's treatise.[30] To be sure, the titles and some subject-matter of Alcuin's first four chapters run parallel to the beginning of the second Book of the Sententiae.[31] The assertion, however, that Alcuin's text contains no part of the text of Isidore's *florilegium* which Alcuin could not have found among Defensor's many excerpts from the Sententiae is mistaken. Rochais does not furnish in his synopsis, for example, the source of Alc., ch. 11 (621A), 'Quando ergo ista in corde hominis fiunt, sciendum est tunc esse Deum per gratiam suam cordi humano presentem,' which is a literal quotation from Sententiae II, 12, 6 (PL 83, 614A). Alcuin's chapters 20 and 21, for which there is one lone parallel (overlooked by Dom Rochais) in Defensor (see below), correspond literally with the text of the Sententiae.

Alcuin, ch. 20, *De judicibus* (PL 101, 628C–629B) is made up of verbatim quotations from Sententiae III (PL 83, 724B–726B, passim) in the following sequence: III, 52,4; 52,2; 52,6–7; 52,11–12; 52,16; 53,1–3. Of these passages only Alcuin 629B 'non est persona in iudicio consideranda, sed causa,' occurs in Defensor, ch. 58 (PL 88, 692B).

Alcuin, ch. 21, *De falsis testibus* (629C–630A) runs parallel to Sententiae III, 55,2,3,7; 54,7; 57,1,2,3,6 (PL 83, 727A–729A, passim).

There can be no doubt that Alcuin used the Sententiae directly.[32] Indeed it is a question whether Alcuin used Defensor at all when compiling his treatise. The mere list of parallel passages by Dom Rochais is not evidence enough for Alcuin's dependence on Defensor, especially when we see that Alcuin used one of the *florilegia* also used by Defensor. Further, parallels to longer passages in Alcuin's treatise, for which not many parallel texts occur

[30] Revue Mabillon 41 (1951), 80.

[31] Migne, PL 83, 599–603.

[32] Alcuin repeatedly expressed special admiration for Isidore of Seville, especially in Adv. Elipandum Libri Quattuor II, 8 (PL 101, 266B): 'Isidori . . . perplurima legebamus opuscula et in magna habemus veneratione.' Alcuin's use of the Sententiae and Synonyma may be added to A. E. Anspach, 'Das Fortleben Isidors im vii. bis ix. Jahrhundert,' Miscellanea Isidoriana (Rome, 1936), 350 f.

in Defensor, are found in certain Pseudo-Augustinian Sermons (Ps.-Aug., App.) in a fuller context.[33] A synoptic survey of the chapters in Alcuin's treatise and these apocryphal homilies will serve to illustrate the point.

Alcuin, PL 101, 614 ff. *chapter*:	Ps.-Aug., App., PL 39, 1932 ff. *sermo*:
1. De sapientia	302,1
2. De fide	108,1,4–5,2
3. De charitate	
4. De spe	
5. De lect. studio	302,2
6. De pace	98,2
7. De misericordia	304,1
8. De indulgentia	304,2
10. De humilitate	297,1
12. De confessione	254,1–2
13. De poenitentia	254,2–3
15. De timore Dei	297,2
18. De castitate	291,1,2,3.

While the editors of the pseudo-Augustinian Appendix assume that the substance of Alcuin's treatise was incorporated into the context of the apocryphal homilies,[34] the editor of Alcuin's treatise refers to its individual chapters as portions evidently derived from Augustinian sermons.[35] We can find the relation between Alcuin and some of the homilies if we weigh internal evidence in the texts.

We read in Alcuin's ch. 8, *De indulgentia* (PL 101, 618D): 'Sciendum est certissime quod unusquisque talem indulgentiam accepturus est a Deo, qualem et ipse dederit proximo suo.' Rochais adduces as the alleged source Defensor, ch. 5, *De indulgentia* (PL 88, 611B): 'Augustinus. Unusquisque talem indulgentiam accepturus est a Deo, qualem et ipse dederit proximo suo.' *Augustinus*, the source of Defensor's citation, is not identified by Rochais. The citation is from Ps.-Aug., App., sermo 304,2 (PL 39, 2329):

[33] Migne, PL 39, In appendice, subsequently always referred to as Ps.-Aug., App. The editor of Alcuin in PL 101, 614 ff., refers to these sermons in the notes; but read 614B 'Serm. 302,' instead of 303; for ch. 6, De pace, the reference to serm. 98 (PL 39, 1933) is missing; 625 note a, read 'serm. 291,' instead of 91.

[34] See the b notes in PL 39, 1932, 2215, 2296, 2313, 2323, 2328.

[35] Cf. PL 101, 614b, 616c, 617a, 618b, 619a, 621a, 623a, 625a.

'Sciendum est certissime quod unusquisque talem indulgentiam accepturus est a Deo, qualem et ipse dederit proximo suo.' Since Alcuin's wording is closer to the text of the sermon than to the incomplete quotation of Defensor, Alcuin clearly used the sermon; and since Defensor obviously took the citation from the sermon, this apocryphal homily is older than both Defensor and Alcuin, and is the source of both.

Another example of the same kind is found in Alcuin's ch. 15, *De timore Dei* (PL 101, 624B): 'Qui timore sancto Deum metuunt, inquirunt quae bona placita sunt illi'; and 'Homo sapiens in omnibus operibus suis metuit Dominum.' Rochais refers to Defensor, ch. 12, *De timore* (PL 88, 630D): 'Augustinus. Qui timent Dominum, inquirunt quae beneplacita sunt illi'; and 'Homo sapiens in omnibus metuit.' The two citations from 'Augustinus' are not identified by Rochais. They occur, however, in Ps.-Aug., App., sermo 297,2 (PL 39, 2314): 'Qui timore sancto Deum metuunt inquirunt quae beneplacita sunt illi'; and 'Homo sapiens in omnibus operibus suis Deum timet.' So, clearly, this homily also antedates Defensor and Alcuin.

For two sentences in Alcuin's ch. 11, *De compunctione cordis* (PL 101, 621A), Rochais refers to Defensor, ch. 6, where both are cited from 'Augustinus.' I have not identified the homily which doubtless served as the source of Defensor and Alcuin. Alcuin's chapters 11, 12, and 13, are also found in Ps.-Aug., App., sermo 254, and since Defensor quotes from an unidentified work of 'Augustinus' which was also used by Alcuin in ch. 11, we must assume that Defensor and Alcuin used the same source, which was quite probably one of the apocryphal homilies ascribed to Augustinus.

Slight verbal parallels seem to join Alcuin, ch. 19 (PL 101, 627D–628A) to Defensor, ch. 77 (PL 88, 711A): 'Augustinus. Ubi lucrum, et ibi damnum. Lucrum in arca, damnum in conscientia. Acquirit pecuniam, et perdit iustitiam.' This quotation is from Ps.-Aug., App., sermo 220,2 (PL 39, 2152), i.e. from Caesarius of Arles' sermo 222,3 (ed. G. Morin, in Corpus Christianorum, series Latina, 104 [Turnholti, 1953], 878 f.). Defensor and Alcuin used this homily. We note that the same 'Augustinus' quotation is found in the report — written in 786 — on two Old

English synods which Alcuin attended (MGH, Epistolae IV, p. 26,4).

The 'Augustinus' quotations of Defensor [36] and Alcuin prove that the apocryphal homilies 297 and 304 antedate both authors, and that Alcuin's chapters 11 and 19 contain similar pseudo-Augustinian materials. Eight 'Augustinus' quotations of Defensor are traced by Dom Rochais [37] to certain sermons of Caesarius of Arles.[38]

One example will reveal the complications we encounter in dealing with a pseudo-Augustinian homily. The editor of sermo 98 (PL 39, 1932b) states that this sermon contains ch. 6, *De pace*, of Alcuin's treatise. He thus assumes that sermo 98 is a post-Alcuinian homily. Dekkers and Gaar [39] also hold No. 98 to be later than Alcuin, and find it in homily 52 of the homiliary of Hrabanus. There can be no doubt that the text of ch. 6 corresponds with homily 98. The question is whether Alcuin copied 98 or the author of 98 copied Alcuin. The first alternative is confirmed by the fact that the content of ch. 6 is traceable to homily 53 of Petrus Chrysologus (PL 52, 347). Sermo 98 itself appears to be an expanded version of Ps.-Aug., App., sermo 61,[40] which in its turn is but another version of Chrysologus, sermo 53. The relation between 98, Alcuin, and Hrabanus seems to be as follows: Hrabanus could have used homily 98 directly, since the two variants (see below) *fratres* and *societatem habet* do not occur in the present text of Alcuin. On the other hand, we find (see below) that a considerable portion (five-sevenths) of Alcuin's text is paralleled by certain sections in the context of fourteen homilies by Hrabanus. So it might well be that Hrabanus' readings are traceable to the MS of Alcuin's treatise used by him. That sermo 98 does antedate Alcuin may be inferred because the homily was used, more extensively than in ch. 6, in his Epistle 219 (p. 363, 19, 23, 24), addressed to the monks of Lerins, lauding their good

[36] Our conclusions presuppose that Defensor's Augustinus quotations are genuine parts of the *florilegium*. Rochais is preparing a critical edition of the Liber Scintillarum: see Revue Bénédictine 63 (1953), 265.

[37] Ibidem 63 (1953), 284.

[38] Ed. Germain Morin, S. Caesarii Arelatensis Sermones I (Maredsous, 1937).

[39] Clavis Patrum Latinorum (Sacris Erudiri 3, 1951), no. 368, p. 67.

[40] Add to Clavis, s.v., sermo 98: 'recensio amplificata sermonis 61.'

reputation, and exhorting them to mutual charity and peace. The *unanimitas pacis*, repeatedly stressed in this letter, but not mentioned by Alcuin in ch. 6, is a special point at issue discussed together with *caritas* in sermo 98, 4–5 (PL 39, 1933 f.).

The following excerpts of an identical passage in its five different transmissions illustrate the possible interdependences just discussed.

Petrus Chrysologus, sermo 53 (PL 52, 347C–348A):

Pax plebis charissimi est gloria sacerdotis, et pacis plena laetitia est perfecta charitas filiorum. Sacerdotis est, admonere quod decet; plebis est, audire quod monet; quidquid non licet, pastoris est prohibere, gregis audire ac velle ne fiat. . . . Custodienda *prae omnibus virtutibus* pax est, quoniam Deus semper in pace est;

Ps.-Augustinus, Appendix, sermo 61,3 (PL 39, 1859):

Pax plebis, gloria est sacerdotis: et parentum laetitia, perfecta charitas filiorum. Sacerdotis . . . [like Chrysologus, above] . . . pastoris est prohibere ne fiat; gregis est audire, ut faciat . . . Custodienda *omnibus viribus* pax est; quoniam Deus semper in pace est;

Ps.-Augustinus, Appendix, sermo 98,2 (PL 39, 1933):

Pax plebis sanitas, gloria sacerdotis, et patriae laetitia, et terror hostium sive visibilium sive invisibilium. *Omnibus viribus* pax est custodienda, fratres, quia semper in Deo manet, qui in pace sancta manet, et cum sanctis Dei societatem habet. Sacerdotis est, in pace populum admonere quod debeat agere; populi est, in humilitate audire quae monet sacerdos. Quidquid non licet, pastoris est prohibere ne fiat; plebis, audire ne faciat;

Alcuin, ch. 6, *De pace* (PL 101, 617C):

Pax plebis est sanitas . . . [the remainder is identical with sermo 98]; there are some variants: Alcuin omits *fratres*, reads *manet* instead of *societatem habet*, and at the end *est* audire; cf. Alcuin, Epist. 18, p. 51, 29 'sanitas plebis';

Hrabanus Maurus, Hom. 52 (PL 110, 96A–B):

This text is identical with sermo 98; Hrabanus reads *fratres*, and *societatem habet*, and *est audire*.

The reading 'custodienda *omnibus viribus* pax est' [41] as against

[41] The same reading appears in the so-called OE Alcuin: 'Seo sibb is mid ealle moeignen to healdene'; see R. D-N. Warner, Early English Homilies from the Twelfth Century MS. Vesp. D. XIV (EETS, Original Series, 152; London, 1917), 95.

Chrysologus' *prae omnibus virtutibus* is noteworthy. According to Chrysologus *pax* belongs to the *virtutes*, while the authors of the expanded version of his sermon evidently no longer shared this notion, which was known to the early Middle Ages especially also from Prudentius, Psychomachia, vv. 769 f.:

> Pax plenum virtutis opus, pax summa laborum,
> Pax belli exacti pretium est pretiumque pericli.

A summary of the preceding inquiry and comparison with the conclusions of Dom Rochais shows that Defensor's *florilegium* cannot have been Alcuin's source, for Alcuin excerpted some of the writings also excerpted by Defensor, such as Isidore of Seville's *florilegia* and pseudo-Augustinian homilies. One of these homilies was identified (above) with a homily of Caesarius of Arles, whose sermo 18, 2–6 (CCL 103, pp. 83–86), for example, supplied Alcuin with two-thirds of the text of ch. 14 (623B–D). It seems that Alcuin was also familiar with Pomerius, De vita contemplativa, since excerpts from Pomerius are found in Alcuin's ch. 23, *De superbia*.[42] The homiletic nature of at least the first part of Alcuin's treatise was obvious to Alcuin's unknown biographer, who wrote: 'Scripsit et ad Widonem comitem *omelias* de principalibus vitiis et virtutibus.'[43]

The Sources of the Section De Vitiis

The second part of Alcuin's treatise, which is not investigated by Dom Rochais, is in eight chapters, each dealing with one of the chief vices (*principales*), namely, pride, gluttony, lust, avarice, anger, sloth, sorrow, and vainglory (Chaps. 26–34). The chapters on the vices are followed by a brief discussion of the four cardinal

[42] Compare this chapter and Pomerius, PL 59, 478A–B; also Alcuin, ch. 3 (PL 101, 615C) and Pomerius III, 13, 14, 15 (PL 59, 493C, 494A ff., 496B–C); A. M. Landgraf, Dogmengeschichte der Frühscholastik I, 1 (Regensburg a.D., 1952), 162 compares Pomerius III, 16 (PL 59, 498) and Alcuin, ch. 35. The first Pomerius item is listed by Dom Rochais, Revue Mabillon 41 (1951), 85. M. L. W. Laistner, Studi e Testi 122 (1946), 356 assumes that Alcuin was unfamiliar with Pomerius when writing his treatise.

[43] Vita Alcuini ch. 21, MGH, Scriptores XV, 195. — There is no apparent connection between the homiletic materials of our treatise and the extant second volume of Alcuin's homiliarium; on the latter see the note in Speculum 29 (1954), 823.

virtues (ch. 35), and a letter-peroration, addressed to the recipient of the handbook. The last paragraph attached to the peroration (in Migne's edition) is a cento of Scriptural passages 'On Friendship' (PL 101, 638CD) which is not an original part of the work. Its origin is not unknown, as Dom Rochais assumes.[44] The passages are taken from Defensor, ch. 63, *De amicitia* (PL 88, 696CD).

The fundamental sources of Alcuin's catalogue of vices are Gregory, Moralia in Job XXXI,45,[45] and Cassian, Collatio V,1 and V,16,5.[46] The themes at the end of each chapter — the specific virtue overcoming its opposing vice — are supplied by Isidore, Sententiae II, 37.[47]

The sequence of chapters 27–34 follows with two exceptions the order of Cassian's classification of vices, though Gregory furnishes the description of the individual *vitia*. Since *acedia* is missing in Gregory's list, Alcuin in this instance follows (635A) Cassian. And although *superbia* is the last vice in Cassian's list, it becomes the first for Alcuin as being the worst vice. Occasionally, both basic sources conflate in Alcuin's description. *Haereses*, for example, derived from Cassian's treatment of *cenodoxia*, is inserted into the description of *superbia*, copied from Gregory. As a rule, the source actually used by Alcuin can be determined without great difficulty. *Malitia* in Alcuin's treatment of *tristitia*, a vice not found in Cassian, Collatio V, 16,5, is taken from Gregory's list of vices (PL 76, 621B).

The occurrence of direct literal citations from Cassian has been wrongly denied by Albert Hauck;[48] for not only the Collationes, but also the De institutis coenobiorum [49] is excerpted by Alcuin. So when Alcuin says in ch. 32, *De acedia*, 'Quae cum miserabilem obsidet mentem,' he obviously follows Cassian, De inst. X,2:

[44] Revue Mabillon 41 (1951), 73.

[45] PL 76, 620–622.

[46] Ed. M. Petschenig, CSEL 13 (Wien, 1886), 142 f.

[47] De pugna virtutum adversus vitia (PL 83, 638); cf. also Isidore's Differentiae II, chaps. 39–40 (PL 83, 95 f.); Quaestiones Testamentorum: In Deuteronomium ch. 16 (PL 83, 366), following Cassian.

[48] Albert Hauck, Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands II (3rd and 4th edd.; Leipzig, 1912), 147 f.: 'Direkt aus Cassian entnommene Sätze habe ich nicht bemerkt.'

[49] De institutis coenobiorum et de octo principalium vitiorum remediis libri XII, ed. M. Petschenig, CSEL 17 (Wien, 1888).

'Quae cum miserabilem obsederit mentem.' Rather incongruously the 'mala otiositas' (De inst. X,20) of the monk is mentioned and rejected in this chapter of our treatise written for a layman! The first bracketed section in *De superbia* (633B) is drawn verbatim from De inst. XII,29. The chapter 'On Vainglory' (635A–D) contains longer excerpts derived word for word from De inst. XI,3,4,6, and 19.[50]

Thus, our study reveals the nature of the treatise on virtues and vices and its author's method of excerpting. The same method of borrowing may be observed in Alcuin's Rhetoric,[51] and in his grammatical treatise De orthographia.[52]

The system of eight vices is also the basis of Alcuin's Confessio peccatorum in the Officia per Ferias (PL 101, 525D). In De animae ratione, however, written for Gundrada, sister of Charlemagne's trusted advisor Adalhard of Corbie, Alcuin enumerates only seven vices: 'gastrimargia, fornicatio, phylargiria, tristitia, acedia, superbia, and cenodoxia.'[53] *Ira* is missing. Alcuin does not consider *ira* an individual vice, since it is assignable to the irascible part of the soul from which *tristitia* and *acedia* also spring. From the two other parts of the soul in this ancient division stem the remaining five vices, pride and vainglory from the rational part, gluttony, lust, and avarice, from the concupiscent. De animae ratione, we note, was one of the sources[54] of De spiritu et anima by the Cistercian Alcher of Clairvaux.

Though the treatise De virtutibus et vitiis, as Schmitz[55] puts it, 's'inspire beaucoup de Saint Augustin,' it is hard to identify in the tractate literal excerpts from genuine Augustinian writings, although the trace of a genuine Augustinian homily can occasionally be seen.[56] But in general there is no ground for thinking with

[50] Ibidem, pp. 195,18–26; 196,13–22; 197,6–10; 203,22–204,6.

[51] Ed. Carl Halm, Rhetores Latini Minores (Leipzig, 1863); cf. note 4, above.

[52] Ed. Aldo Marsili, Alcuini Orthographia (Pisa, 1952).

[53] PL 101, 640C–D; the treatise is partly edited by E. Dümmler in MGH, Epist. IV, no. 309, pp. 473–478.

[54] Alcuin, ch. 11 (PL 101, 644B–C) is verbatim copied in Alcher of Clairvaux's De spiritu et anima (PL 40, 788). On Alcher's authorship of this pseudo-Augustinian writing see H. S. Denifle, Die deutschen Mystiker des 14. Jahrhunderts, ed. Otwin Spiess (Freiburg, Switzerland, 1951), 81.

[55] Philibert Schmitz, Histoire de l'Ordre de Saint-Benoît II (Maredsous, 1949), 379.

[56] Compare, for example, Alcuin, ch. 30 (PL 101, 634B) and Augustine, sermo

Kleinclausz [57] 'that most of the chapters on the virtues are literally indebted to sermons of the great African doctor,' or that 'Alcuin reasoned and thought independently in the chapters on the vices, especially where he dramatically confronts the virtues and the vices.' Nor is there a basis for Kleinclausz's assumption that Cicero's De officiis supplied Alcuin with the definitions of the cardinal virtues (in ch. 35).

The Influence of the Treatise

The treatise De virtutibus et vitiis was read and copied during the ninth and subsequent centuries. About 22 MSS, saec. IX–X, are still extant,[58] and more from the following centuries are found in the libraries of all Western and Central European countries. A lone MS copy of the work has just now reached this country.[59]

Carolingian writers used the treatise. The chapter on the cardinal virtues (ch. 35) was copied by Alcuin himself in his Rhetoric.[60] Some excerpts are inserted in an epistle of unknown Frankish origin that was sent to Italy during the early ninth century.[61] Jonas of Orléans in De institutione laicali [62] acknowledges his indebtedness to the section on the vices. A contemporary of Louis the Pious dedicated to his sovereign distichs on the virtues and the vices for which he adopted 32 chapter-titles in the sequence of Alcuin's treatise.[63] To these Carolingian witnesses we may add Halitgar of Cambrai, and Alcuin's pupil Hrabanus Maurus.

Halitgar of Cambrai appropriated Alcuin's definitions of the

177, ed. D. C. Lambot, S. Aurel. August. Sermones Selecti (Stromata Patristica et Mediaevalia I; Utrecht-Bruxelles, 1950), 68; for Alcuin, ch. 14 see Appendix 28, and Revue Mabillon 41 (1951), 83.

[57] Arthur Kleinclausz, Alcuin (Paris, 1948), 221. There are slight verbal parallels between Alcuin's definition of *prudentia* (in ch. 35) and Cicero, De officiis I, 153, but not enough to assume certain dependence.

[58] Listed by Rochais, Revue Bénédictine 63 (1953), 251 note 4.

[59] This MS is listed in the sales Catalogue I, p. 2, no. 2, quoted in note 27, above.

[60] Wallach, Medievalia et Humanistica 6 (1950), 41.

[61] MGH, Epistolae IV, no. 2, pp. 484–491.

[62] In Lib. III, 6; cf. PL 106, 244–247A; compare also Alcuin, ch. 23 (630D), and the sentence from this chapter quoted by Jonas in III, 4 (PL 106, 239A).

[63] Omitting those of Alcuin's chaps. 1, 20, 26; see Strecker, MGH, Poetae IV, pp. 924–27.

four cardinal virtues (ch. 35) in five chapters of his Penitential, Bk. II.[64] Alcuin's influence is further noticeable in Bk. I, chaps. 6, 10–12, and 14.

We have referred above to some homilies of Hrabanus Maurus. It can be shown that the text of 25 of the 35 chapters of Alcuin's treatise is paralleled by certain sections in the context of 14 homilies by Hrabanus,[65] namely, Nos. 45, 47–49, 51–56, 58–60, and 62. Hrabanus' sermons are always more extensive than the chapters of Alcuin. Some of Hrabanus' homilies could be combinations of individual chapters of Alcuin's treatise, as may be deduced from the following summary.

Chapters 1 and 5 of Alcuin correspond with *Homilia* 48 of Hrabanus; chaps. 2, 3, 4 with hom. 45; ch. 6: hom. 52; chaps. 7–8: hom. 51; chaps. 10 and 15 with hom. 54; chaps. 11, 12, 13:hom. 55; 14:56; 16:49; 17:53; 18:47; chaps. 19 and 30:hom. 62; chaps. 20 and 21:hom. 58; chaps. 23 and 25:hom. 59; chaps. 24 and 31:hom. 60. For eleven of Alcuin's chapters (9, 22, 26–29, 32–36) parallels seem to be absent in Hrabanus' homilies.

Some of Hrabanus' sermons are identified by Dekkers and Gaar [66] with pseudo-Augustinian homilies that are also used, as we saw, by Alcuin. These identifications can now be supplemented and corrected in accordance with our findings. Hrabanus indeed utilized some of these apocryphal sermons that were not excerpted by Alcuin, for instance, serm. 194, 280, and 290. But the statement in Dekkers and Gaar, Clavis, No. 368, s.v., sermo 98, 'est in homiliario Hrabani Mauri homilia 52' can only refer to the identity of the texts, and not to Hrabanus' authorship of the sermon, because its origin has been ascertained (see above). Since Alcuin used sermo 98 in his treatise, Hrabanus' authorship of no. 98 is impossible. The same conclusion holds for Ps.-Aug., App., serm. 297 and 304, which are paralleled in the Clavis with hom. 54 and 51 of Hrabanus; the use made by Alcuin of nos. 297 and 304 forbids us to assume that Hrabanus was the author of these two pseudo-Augustinian homilies.

[64] In chaps. 6–10 (PL 105, 673D–674A; 674D–675A; 675C; 676A); see Alcuin's chaps. 22, 28, 30, and 33 in PL 105, 662B, 667B, 664D, and 665A.

[65] Homiliae de virtutibus, PL 110, 82 ff. I have not seen Aloys Ruppel on Hrabanus in Jahrbuch für das Bistum Mainz 3 (1948), 117–137.

[66] Clavis (see above note 39), pp. 67–70.

Hrabanus also copied for Book III of De ecclesiastica disciplina [67] from Alcuin's chapters 2, 4, 3, 6, 9, 23, 24, 28, and 30–32.

The definitions of virtue and the four cardinal virtues in Hrabanus' De vitiis et virtutibus, Bk. III [68] whose first two Books are identical with Halitgar's Penitential, Bks. I–II, are not from Alcuin's ch. 35, but from Alcuin's Rhetoric, chaps. 44–45.[69] Hrabanus here cites a sentence from Alcuin's Rhetoric [70] which does not occur in Alcuin's ch. 35.

Onulf of Speyer, writing his Colores Rhetorici in the seventies of the eleventh century, quotes [71] from Alcuin's chap. 35.

The definition of the three kinds of alms in the Corpus Iuris Canonici, decr. I, dist. 45, q. xii, seems to be derived from Alcuin's ch. 12, *De eleemosynis*.

A manuscript of the treatise which probably contained only the section on the vices was known to Wolfger of Prüfening,[72] who in his literary history, formerly ascribed to the so-called Anonymus Mellicensis, lists the writings of Alcuin, and says: 'Scribit de octo viciis ad Gwidonem comitem.' [73]

Considerable use was made of Alcuin's treatise in Old and Middle English Literatures. Aelfric inserted excerpts in his Homiliae Catholicae,[74] and an Old English translation of the first sixteen chapters preserved in a MS of the twelfth century [75] probably was made in his period. About 1300, or perhaps a little later, Alcuin's work became the immediate source of the early English metrical poem, Speculum Gy de Warewyke,[76] and largely determined the

[67] PL 112, in the following sequence corresponding to the Alcuin chaps. listed above: 1234A–C, 1236A–C, 1236D–1237B, 1257B, 1240D–1241A, 1242C, 1246B–C, 1245A, 1241D–1242A, and 1252A.

[68] PL 112, 1253D, 1254B, 1254D, 1255A.

[69] Ed. Carl Halm (see note 51, above), p. 548 f.; Karl Werner, Alkuin und sein Jahrhundert (Paderborn, 1876), 257 wrongly assumes that Hrabanus followed De virtutibus et vitiis, ch. 35.

[70] Ed. Halm, p. 549, 27 f. from 'Honor eximius . . . apud Deum'; compare the Hrabanus citation in PL 112, 1255A.

[71] Wallach, 'Onulf of Speyer: A Humanist of the Eleventh Century,' Medievalia et Humanistica 6 (1950), 40.

[72] Now ascribed to him by H. von Fichtenau, 'Wolfger von Prüfening,' Mitteilungen des Inst. für Oesterreich. Geschichtsforschung 51 (1937), 341–351.

[73] De scriptoribus ecclesiasticis, ed. Emil Ettlinger (Karlsruhe, 1896), ch. 41, p. 70.

[74] Max Förster, Anglia 16 (1893–94), 46 f.

[75] Referred to in note 41, above.

[76] Ed. G. L. Morrill, Speculum Gy de Warewyke (EETS, Extra Series, 75; London, 1898), pp. xciii-cxiv, and cxvii f., on Alcuin's influence on Gy.

trend of the argument. Finally, an Old Norse translation of the treatise is found in a MS of the twelfth or thirteenth century.[77]

The popularity of the treatise De virtutibus et vitiis during the Middle Ages as evinced by the number of MSS, by its influence on authors from the ninth until the fourteenth centuries who wrote in Latin and in vernacular languages, calls for a new edition of the treatise. Migne's edition of 1851 is reprinted from the second volume of Alcuin's Opera published by Froben at Regensburg on-the-Danube in 1777. It is not based on the oldest and best MSS, and is now inadequate in the light of modern standards of textual editing.

APPENDIX

1. Alcuin and the Commonitiuncula ad Sororem?

An anonymous treatise, presumably from the second half of the seventh century, in the MSS ascribed variously to Augustine, Ambrose, Jerome,[78] or Caesarius of Arles, and by A. E. Anspach,[79] its most recent editor, assigned to Isidore of Seville, is said to have left traces in Alcuin's De virtutibus et vitiis. But the assumption of such an influence on Alcuin cannot stand the test of a critical examination. Careful comparison of both treatises does not disclose evidence to support the contentions made by Anspach and Vaccari.

The introductory letter of the Comm(onitiuncula ad Sororem) is not the source of Alcuin's dedicatory epistle to Wido. The purely Alcuinian origin of the epistle has been demonstrated in the first part of this paper. Alcuin certainly needed no recourse to the exordium of the Comm., 'Tuae non immemor petitionis, o charissima mater, tibi ut rogasti, scribere studui,' in order to say in his exordium (Ep. 305, p. 464,11): '*Memor petitionis tuae et promissionis meae*, qua me obnixe

[77] See G. T. Flom, Codex AM 619 Quarto: Old Norwegian Book of Homilies . . . and Alcuin's De virtutibus et vitiis (Univ. of Illinois Studies in Language and Literature 14, 4; 1929); Gustav Indrebø, Gamal Norsk Homiliebok Cod. AM 619. 4° (Oslo, 1931) and the Facsimile-edition by Trygve Knudsen, Gammelnorsk Homiliebok Etter AM 619 QV (Corpus Codicum Norvegicorum Medii Aevi, ed. D. A. Seip, Quarto Serie I; Oslo, 1952).

[78] Cf. Alberto Vaccari, 'Un trattato ascetico attribuito a S. Girolamo,' Mélanges offerts au R. P. Ferdinand Cavallera (Toulouse, 1948), 147–162.

[79] A. E. Anspach, S. Isidori Hispalensis Episcopi Commonitiuncula ad Sororem (Script. eccl. hispano-latini veteris et medii aevi, IV; Escorial, 1935); Dom Rochais, Revue Bénédictine 63 (1953), 251 note 1, offers a list of extant MSS.

flagitasti aliquod tuae occupationi, quam te in bellicis rebus habere novimus.' This is merely a commonplace, repeated elsewhere. For example, the same exordium is used in Alcuin's dedicatory letter that accompanies parts of the Commentary of John which he presented to Gisla, sister of Charlemagne (Ep. 214, p. 357,29): '*Memor petitionis vestrae et promissionis meae*, quamvis tardius implerem propter occupationes perplurimas. . .' An often stereotyped exordial technique is a feature of Alcuin's epistles. The formula-like phrase '*Memor condictae amicitiae inter nos*,' for instance, occurs as the exordium in seven of his letters.[80]

The testimonia of the Comm. allegedly preserved in Alcuin's chapters 3, 10, and 11, are hardly in point. The slight similarities between the two texts can be explained; the authors of both writings excerpted the same source. The mediaeval scribe of an expanded MS tradition of the Comm. must have been aware of this source, since he inserted into ch. XIII a passage from Isidore of Seville's Sententiae III, 8,2 (PL 83, 679B), which occurs also in Alcuin's ch. 5 (PL 101, 616D). Alcuin drew directly on Isidore's *florilegium*, which was — as we have seen — one of the main sources of his treatise. The passage in question assumed topical significance in Alcuin's epistolary style and appears as such in at least three of his letters.[81] An interpolated passage in MS E of the Comm. (ed. Anspach, p. 34), which is identical with the opening sentences of Alcuin, ch. 5 (PL 101, 614C), might be traceable to a direct borrowing from Alcuin by the scribe of MS E, or else be directly derived from the pseudo-Augustinian sermo 302,2 (PL 39), which contains the same sentences.

2. Alcuin and Caesarius of Arles

The relation between Alcuin and Hrabanus Maurus can be more closely determined by an investigation of the use made by Alcuin of Caesarius of Arles' serm. 18, 2–6 (ed. G. Morin, CCL 103, 83–86, passim) in ch. 14 (PL 101, 623 f.). The literal borrowings from this homily in ch. 14 are here printed in italics. Compare:

Legitur in litteris divinitus inspiratis dictum: "Fili, ne tardes converti ad Deum, quia nescis, quid futura pariat dies" (Eccli. 5.8). Qui tardat converti, periculum facit animae suae, quia "mors non tardat" (Eccli. 14.12). Quae si tardantem converti inveniet, ad tormenta deducit eum. *Dissoluta* et *paralytica cogitatio* est, de crastina cogitare conversione, et hodiernam negligere. Quid tu, peccator, *converti dissimulas, et non metuis, ne tibi mors repentina subripiat* diem conversionis? *Nonne homines subito moriuntur? Si bonum est* peccata dimittere, et ad Deum converti,

[80] Epistles nos. 11, 24, 108, 122, 128, 263, 298.
[81] Epistle 296, p. 455,26; 270, p. 429,6; 228, p. 372,7.

cito fiat. Deus tibi *promittit* remissionem convertenti a peccatis, *securitatem* tibi non promisit diu vivendi. (Lege prophetas, lege Apostolum, et vide si tibi promissa sit hora aut dies). *Ideo convertat se* citius *unusquisque ad Deum*, et cum invenerit eum, derelinquat impius viam suam. Si *subito intrat dies extremus, perit dilatio, et restat damnatio.* Perire non vis, redi ad Deum, et vives. Noli desperare (MS: peccando sperare) de venia peccatorum, *nec de vita longiori confidere. Convertere ergo*, et poenitentiam age. *Cras, inquies*, convertam. *Quare non hodie? Quid mali*, dicis, *si cras* dicam? *Quid mali, si hodie?* Forte dicis: *Longa erit vita* mea. Dicam, *si longa erit, bona sit; si brevis, et ipsa bona sit. Quis ferat malum longum prandium? Longum non vis habere malum, et vitam longam vis habere malam? Villam emis; bonam* desideras. *Uxorem vis ducere; bonam* quaeris. *Filios tibi nasci vis; bonos optas. Et ut etiam de rebus vilissimis loquar, caligas emis, et non vis malas. Et vitam amas malam? Quid te offendit vita tua, quam solam vis malam, ut inter omnia bona tua solus sis malus?* "Neque tardes converti ad Dominum, et ne differas de die in diem" (Eccli. 5.8). *Verba Dei sunt, non mea. Non a me haec audisti, sed ego tecum audio* a Domino. Forte *respondes: Cras, cras. O vox corvina! Corvus non redi(i)t ad arcam, columba redi(i)t. Si enim tunc vis poenitentiam agere quando peccare non potes, peccata te dimiserunt, non tu illa.* Satis alienus a fide est, qui ad agendum poenitentiam tempus senectutis exspectat. . . .

Alcuin's dependence on Caesarius' homily is obvious. Since the complete text of Alcuin's ch. 14 appears in Hrabanus Maurus' sermo 56 (PL 110, 104 f.), where it constitutes about one half of the entire sermon, Hrabanus clearly inserted the text of Alcuin's chapter into his homily. The same relationship exists between all the other chapters of Alcuin's treatise and those homilies of Hrabanus' collection De virtutibus that borrowed from Alcuin's De virtutibus et vitiis. We finally note one of the rarely found literal borrowings from a genuine Augustinian sermon; the passage 'Si enim tunc . . . non tu illa' is taken from Augustine's sermo 393 (PL 39, 1715).

SOME NOTES UPON THE CAREER OF ROBERT GROSSETESTE

JOSIAH COX RUSSELL
University of New Mexico

The seventh centenary of the death of Robert Grosseteste, the brilliant theologian and scientist who became bishop of Lincoln, was celebrated in 1953 and stimulated some interest in him and his work.[1] The same year saw the publication of an outstanding study of his contribution to the origins of experimental science. The author of this study regards Grosseteste as "the first medieval writer to recognize and deal with the two fundamental methodological problems of induction and experimental verification and falsification which arose when the Greek conception of geometrical demonstration was applied to the world of experience."[2] Grosseteste's eminent position in science and theology[3] thus makes the problem of his early life and education more significant both as to sources of influence and dates and places of education.

The early life of Robert Grosseteste has had to be reconstructed because the biography presented by earlier biographers was erroneous in many respects.[4] When these errors were eliminated, the biography by Richard, monk of Bardney, published by Wharton, appeared substantially correct, and falls in line with the mass and location of the many manuscripts of Grosseteste's writings.[5] In

[1] Notably a lecture by Sir Maurice Powicke which appears in the Bulletin of the John Rylands Library XXXV (1953), 482–507 and a volume upon phases of Grosseteste's career and writings by Oxford medievalists edited by D. Callus and R. W. Hunt soon to appear.

[2] A. C. Crombie, Robert Grosseteste and the Origins of Experimental Science, 1100–1700 (Oxford, 1953), p. 10. For other references of importance to this study see also pp. 10–11, 74–76, 84–106 and 132–34.

[3] See especially A. G. Little, "The Franciscan School at Oxford in the Thirteenth Century," Archivum Franciscanum Historicum XIX (1926), 3–74.

[4] In my "The Preferments and 'Adiutores' of Robert Grosseteste," Harvard Theological Review XXVI (1933), 161–72.

[5] Bardney's poem is published in H. Wharton, Anglia Sacra, II, 325–41. For a criticism of it see my "Richard of Bardney's Account of Robert Grosseteste's Early and Middle Life," Medievalia et Humanistica II (1944), 45–54. The manuscripts are listed in S. H. Thomson, The Writings of Robert Grosseteste, Bishop of Lincoln, 1235–53 (Cambridge, 1940) and their implications discussed in my "Phases of Grosseteste's Intellectual Life," Harvard Theological Review XLIII (1950), 93–116.

this study the examination of evidence is continued in a series of notes which seem to throw additional light upon his career, particularly upon his early religious development and upon the difficult problem of his activities in the years 1214–24.[6]

I

The first problem is that of the date of the Anglo-Norman religious poems which are definitely attributed to Grosseteste. They belong to a conservative tradition and thus are different from his later religious and theological work. They may well come from an early period of his life from which few of his writings seem to have survived, probably when he was at Lincoln.

The presence at Lincoln of Grosseteste, already a master, is indicated by his name in a charter witness list of 1186–89, by Bardney's life, and possibly by his handwriting.[7] He would appear to have been a clerk of Bishop Hugh I of Lincoln, later canonized as a saint. This Bishop Hugh was a remarkably fine person who combined personal integrity with an impressive record at the English court. Further evidence of Grosseteste's association with this bishop is shown by an expression of deep affection for St. Hugh, written long after the saint's death when Grosseteste himself was bishop of Lincoln.[8] During those years an outstanding but conservative theologian, William de Monte or de Montibus, was chancellor at Lincoln, a scholar of such fame that the well-known Gerald of Wales studied there about 1192–98.[9] Under such influences Grosseteste might be expected to write poems with such titles as the Castle of Love and the Nine Daughters of the Devil.[10]

[6] D. Callus presents a somewhat different interpretation of the years 1214–24 in his "The Oxford Career of Robert Grosseteste," Oxoniensia X (1945), 42–72.

[7] A copy of the charter appears in British Museum, MS Reg. 11 B ix, fol. 25r. It is discussed in my "Preferments and 'Adiutores'" (see above) pp. 162–63. Bardney, chs. viii–xv. For the handwriting see Thomson, The Writings of Robert Grosseteste, pp. 22–23.

[8] "Sed quia ipse (Hugh), retribuat ei Deus, per specialem dilectionem me suo unierat cordi et animo, quem vestre tam specialis caritatis amplexata est latitudo." Roberti Grosseteste- -Epistolae (Rolls Series), p. 136.

[9] See under Giraldus Cambrensis in the Dictionary of National Biography.

[10] These are edited respectively by J. Murray, Le Chateau d'Amour de Robert Grosseteste, Evêque de Lincoln (Paris, 1918) and by P. Meyer, "Notices du MS

The Castle of Love is a religious history of humanity and the castle itself is Virgin Mary. This type of allegory was a part of the conservative religious tradition of the twelfth century when the concept of the Virgin as a castle was quite popular.[11] The ideal is heavily feudal, and the references to the Holy Land may even indicate the influence of the Third Crusade.[12] In any case both poems exhibit much feudal terminology. The Castle of Love tells of Adam losing the seisin of Paradise (lines 129–31),[13] while later the Devil has seisin of the earth (1023). Such technical terms as 'un tres grant forfeit' (239), 'cirographez' (1032), 'franchise' (953, 1382) are striking as was also the very English 'hue e huch e hue e crie' (792–93). Even more marked is the feudal interest in the Nine Daughters of the Devil. The author mentions in it 'chivalers e franc tenanz' (71–72), 'roys, princes, countes, barons, chivalers, valles et garsons,' (172–73), 'a serjaunt' (197), 'ou chevaler ou serjaunt' (217), 'as provoste et as faus baillyfs' (455), 'A Dieux et a ses serjauntz' (419) and a 'faus serjaunt' (473). He tells of feudal activities: a talliage for a marriage (187–89), the levy of a talliage (198), the levy of a ransom (202–07) and the rendering of an account (180–81). The spirit of feudalism permeates these pieces and shows Grosseteste's deep interest in secular society at the time.

In the Nine Daughters Grosseteste makes certain references to contemporary costume. A false sergeant wears a white coif (488–89), which was common enough in the period. The best dressed daughter was Orgulle, who wore a crespine (hair net) of fine gold (604) and whose gown raised the dust as she walked along (565–70). Now about the end of the twelfth century the crespine and the barbette were introduced.[14] Since Grosseteste mentions the one, but not the other, the time of the poem may well be at the end of the century. At the same time women's clothes were lengthened until they swept the ground.[15] The poet gives the

Rawlinson, Poetry 241," Romania XXIX (1900), 1–84. For the manuscripts see Thomson, Writings, pp. 152–59.

[11] Roberta D. Cornelius, The Figurative Castle (Bryn Mawr, 1930), especially pp. 42–44.

[12] Especially in lines 75, 193 and 1246.

[13] These numbers are of the lines in the two poems.

[14] I. Brooke, English Costume of the early Middle Ages (London, 1930), p. 48.

[15] Ibid., p. 52.

impression that it was the dress rather than the sleeves which raised the dust. Very long sleeves disappeared at about the end of the century also. Under the circumstances, the last decade of the twelfth century rather than a date in the thirteenth century would seem a proper time.[16]

Another indication of early composition is the poor quality of the French used by the author. It is doubtful if he would have written such lines after he went to Paris about 1209. The story of bad daughters who would be wed to appropriate persons was told of Richard I: pride, avarice and luxury who would marry Templars, Cistercians and Benedictines respectively.[17] Even the interest in the peculiar characteristics of numbers appears in one of William de Monte's most popular books, the Numerale. The interest in secular and feudal activities that appears in the two religious poems also appears in a treatise on manners at court which has been tentatively assigned to the same early period of Grosseteste's life.[18] It would seem, then, that Grosseteste's interests at Lincoln about 1186–89 and probably for some years thereafter were both religious as indicated by his Anglo-Norman poems and secular, as apparent both in them and in his charter witnessing.

II

No interest in medicine would seem to appear in the two long religious poems. This absence may have some significance since, as we have seen, the author did go out of his way to exhibit his knowledge of legal and feudal terms. Yet when Gerald of Wales wrote to Bishop William de Vere of Hereford before the latter's death in 1199, he used an expression which has been interpreted as showing that Grosseteste had some knowledge of medicine.[19] Now Bardney states that there was a period of study at Cambridge between Grosseteste's experience at Lincoln and his stay with a bishop, wrongly identified as the bishop of Salisbury. Crombie has presented considerable evidence that Grosseteste

[16] Murray, p. 45; Meyer, pp. 62–64.

[17] Giraldi Cambrensis Opera (Rolls Series), VI, 47; Roger of Hoveden (Rolls Series), IV, 76; Walter of Hemingburgh (English Historical Society), I, 229.

[18] See my "Phases of Grosseteste's Intellectual Life," pp. 107–110.

[19] Giraldi Cambrensis Opera (Rolls Series) I, 249.

did study medicine and that the source of his medical knowledge may have been some books translated by Gerard of Cremona.[20] This is interesting in that Daniel of Merlai who saw Gerard at Toledo and brought back precious volumes from Spain may have been at Cambridge about the time when Grosseteste is thought to have been there.[21]

In his well-known letter, Gerald spoke of Grosseteste as in the employ of the bishop of Hereford, a statement which is confirmed by the appearance of Grosseteste's name in the witness lists of the bishop's charters.[22] Presumably he served the bishop until the latter's death in 1199. Entirely overlooked is another reference in Gerald's correspondence with the same bishop which shows a Master Robert preparing schedules for Gerald himself in regard to a case with the bishop of St. David's.[23] Since Gerald had recommended Grosseteste as one who was skilled in such matters, it seems most probable that he was writing upon the basis of his association with Grosseteste, presumably at Lincoln about 1196–98.

The next letter in Gerald's collection, addressed to high officials of the Papal Curia, probably contains another reference to Grosseteste. It says that R., Gerald's clerk and familiar, will bring to the attention of the addressees Gerald's troubles with the bishop of St. David's, probably the case mentioned in the preceding letter.[24] It was written before the death of Bishop Peter on

[20] Bardney, ch. xvi; Crombie, pp. 74–77.

[21] H. G. Richardson, "The Schools of Northampton in the Twelfth Century," English Historical Review LVI (1941), 595–605, especially pp. 604–05. For the introduction of Arabic knowledge into England see a chapter of that title in C. H. Haskins, Studies in the History of Mediaeval Science (Cambridge, Mass., 1924) or in the revised edition of 1927.

[22] See references in Oxford, Balliol College, MS 271, fol. 56^{v} and 88^{v} as a clerk, and fol. 6^{v} and 79^{v} with no indication of status.

[23] "Injurias mihi a domino Menevensi episcopo preter merita nuper irrogatas, per magistrum Robertum in scedula conscriptas, destinando vestre discretioni significare curavi." Giraldi Cambrensis Opera (Rolls Series), I, 307. Gerald's better known letter (ibid., p. 249) has the following expression, "Tam in negotiis vestris variis et causarum decisionibus — cum in horum peritia fideliter prestet."

[24] "Hinc est quod vestrae paternitati nostra devotio preces porrigit affectuosas, rogans et supplicans quatinus negotiis nostris, quae presentium lator R. clericus noster vobis ostendet, et illi praecipue contra Menevensem episcopum — similiter et negotiis praesentium latoris hujus, clerici et familiaris nostri ecclesiis suis, sicut vobis intimabit." Ibid., I, 308. He may be the Master Robertus Secretarius at Lincoln sometime in 1196–98. The Registrum Antiquissimum of the Cathedral Church of Lincoln, V, 34. He was not the Robertus de Capella, chaplain of Bishop

July 16, 1198. Now Bardney (ch. xvii) has a fantastic story of a miraculous trip to Rome placed at about this point in Grosseteste's life. It is a type of story often told of men who had gained a reputation for magic and may have no other basis than a very rapid trip to Rome although even this was not necessary. It is interesting to see Grosseteste as a young man getting his legal experience in the company of so enthusiastic a controversialist as Gerald and it also shows Grosseteste close to Welsh interests.

III

In between his service with the bishop of Hereford and his study at the University of Paris occurred very probably a period of study and teaching at Oxford. When did he go to Paris? An interesting and well known story has it that Bishop Hugh of Lincoln (1209–35) refused to give Grosseteste the title of Chancellor of the University of Oxford and would only allow him the title, Master of the Schools.[25] The chronology of titles at Oxford in the period is as follows: a "Master of the Schools" appears in 1201, a "Rector of the Schools" in 1210, and a "Chancellor" in 1214. This series tends to confirm the story, indicating that the head of the schools was not satisfied with the title, Master of the Schools, and did not immediately secure the title of "Chancellor." The story about Grosseteste and the bishop of Lincoln can be narrowed in time to the period in 1209 when Hugh was elected and 1210. Indeed it can probably be limited to a few weeks early in 1209 before the bishop left England.[26] Grosseteste then probably left Oxford for the continent at the end of the academic year of 1208–09.

Hugh, who appears frequently in charters and died about the same time as Hugh. Cf. Magna Vita S. Hugonis Ep. Linc. (Rolls Series), p. 358.

[25] For this see my "Phases of Grosseteste's intellectual Life," pp. 100–03.

[26] Master J. Grim appears in the Cartulary of the Abbey of Eynsham, ed. H. E. Salter (Oxford, 1908), II, 45–46. For Mr. Alardus, rector of the schools, see H. Rashdall, The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages, rev. by A. B. Emden and F. M. Powicke (Oxford, 1936), III, 39. Bishop Hugh was not in England on June 25, 1214 when Cardinal Nicholas of Tusculum sealed the charter of reformation of the schools of Oxford and gave them a chancellor. Cf. Rot. Litt. Pat. p. 114b; Rot. Chart., I, 199, 202b. The charter does not indicate whether the 'chancellor' named was of the diocese or of the university, but since he is named after the archdeacon, it cannot refer to the chancellor of the diocese who had precedence over the archdeacon.

IV

A major problem of Grosseteste's career, already mentioned, concerns his activities during the years in and about 1214–24. One belief is that he returned to England and was one of the early, if not the first, chancellor of Oxford University. Bardney, however, states that Grosseteste served in an administrative capacity a king who must almost certainly have been Philip Augustus of France (1180–1223).[27] These two hypotheses set up two quite different careers for Grosseteste. If the first is accurate he would have finished his theological training in the years following 1209 and then have continued to teach theology until his election as bishop of Lincoln in 1235. He would thus have had a career of about twenty years as a professor of theology at the time of his election. If the other theory is correct, he would apparently have studied theology intently about 1209–14 and again after 1225. The first theory would probably make theology his major interest while the second would indicate possibly a deeper interest in science during the period. He would have had a teaching career in theology of only a few years before he became bishop. The first thesis assumes an association with Paris of only about five years, while the second presupposes a residence in France of perhaps fourteen years.

During the years 1214–24 Grosseteste's name appears in no documents in either England or France as yet. While the argument from silence is always dangerous, it is surprising that, if Grosseteste was at Oxford during the period 1214–35, his name should turn up in documents only after 1224. On the other hand apparently no lists of the clerks of Philip Augustus remain. This king had an English physician, Master John of St. Albans, while his son brought with him on his invasion of England in 1216–18 several important English clerks.[28] Silence then about Grosse-

[27] Bardney, ch. xxiii.

[28] For Mr. John of St. Albans, who has been confused with others, see my Dictionary of Writers of Thirteenth Century England (London, 1936), p. 73. The clerks were Mr. Robert of St. Germain, Mr. Elias of Derham, Mr. Simon Langton and Mr. Gervase of Hobregge, Dean of St. Paul's. Historie des Ducs de Normandie, p. 197. See also Bliss, Calendar of Papal Documents, I, 63. Gerald of Wales favored the French side. F. M. Powicke, "Gerald of Wales," Bulletin of the John Rylands Library XII (1928), 389–410, especially p. 400.

teste's presence in France, even at the royal court, would be natural. Then the distribution of manuscripts of Grosseteste's writings between the continent and England also suggests a long continental stay in this period of his life.[29] The following series of notes consider the implications of a number of items with regard to these hypotheses.

V

The preferments which a man held often indicates something of the course of his career. Those held by Grosseteste are of peculiar interest. According to Bardney, Bishop Hugh of Lincoln gave Grosseteste the church of North Clifton, a prebend of the cathedral, to provide him with support during his theological training.[30] He links this grant with his study, probably at Paris, and thus places it about 1209. The bishop lost most of his revenues when King John forced their surrender in retaliation for Hugh's consecration at the hands of the exiled archbishop, Stephen Langton, late in 1209.[31] These surrendered revenues were naturally given to the king's favorites. It is possible that Grosseteste suffered the same fate with North Clifton. By July 5, 1215 this church was in the hands of Marchisius d'Aubigné, a clerk in such high favor with King John that he was granted custody of the vacant bishopric of Worcester in 1216.[32] Grosseteste never seems to have been in possession of North Clifton at a later date and his other preferments seem to date only from 1225.

The church of St. Margaret of Abbotsley, Huntingtonshire, in the diocese of Lincoln had been vacant since November 5, 1224. By virtue of a decree of the Fourth Lateran Council, the bishop could fill it after six months' vacancy. Bishop Hugh thus gave the church to Grosseteste by a document of April 25, 1225.[33] It

[29] See my "Phases of Grosseteste's Intellectual Life," pp. 98, 115–16.

[30] Bardney, ch. xxi–ii.

[31] Matthew Paris, Chronica Majora (Rolls Series), II, 528.

[32] The Registrum Antiquissimum of the Cathedral Church of Lincoln, III, 255. Rot. Litt. Pat., pp. 166b, 174b, 175. See also ibid., p. 59; Rot. Litt. Claus., I, 121b. He was a brother of the courtier, Philip d'Aubigné. Registrum Antiquissimum, III, 216 and also III, 141–42.

[33] Rotuli Hugonis de Welles, III, 48. For the dedication see F. Arnold-Forster, Studies in Church Dedications (London, 1899), III, 27.

seems to have belonged to Jedburgh Abbey [34] which acceded to a regular institution two years later.[35] This living had cure of souls apparently which seems to have disturbed Grosseteste when he added his prebend of Lincoln.[36] In 1229 he became archdeacon of Leicester and probably acquired the rectory of St. Margaret of Leicester at the same time, since that church usually went with the archdeaconry and was a prebend of Lincoln Cathedral.[37] Just before the Feast of All Souls (November 2) of 1232, he had a fever [38] and resigned his livings except St. Margaret of Leicester before the twelfth of the month.[39] Grosseteste wrote an Anglo-Norman poem to St. Margaret, who was the patron of both of his livings.[40] The impression one has is that a new chapter in Grosseteste's holdings began about 1225, a little difficult to understand if he spent the whole period, 1214–35, in England.

VI

There are references in three of Grosseteste's letters which may assume a long acquaintance in France with the correspondents. Grosseteste writes that he has been acquainted a long time with John Blund, a professor at Paris probably about 1209–29 and after 1233.[41] Grosseteste could have become his friend at Oxford before 1209 or again between 1229 and 1233. In another letter he asks to have John of St. Giles, a famous Dominican, with him, writing as if he were well acquainted with him.[42] John had lived at Paris or on the continent for many years before 1235. Similarly he writes of Bishop William Arvernus of Paris as of an intimate friend,[43] who is not known to have resided in England.

[34] Rotuli Ricardi Gravesend, p. 177.

[35] Rotuli Hugonis de Welles, III, 54.

[36] Roberti Grosseteste Epistolae (Rolls Series), p. 242.

[37] In the 20th year (December 20, 1228–December 20, 1229). Rotuli Hugonis de Welles, II, 307. (W. still archdeacon), pp. 308, 309. Registrum Antiquissimum, III, 231.

[38] Roberti Grosseteste Epistolae, pp. 43–44.

[39] Registrum Antiquissimum, III, 235.

[40] Thomson, Writings of Robert Grosseteste, p. 157.

[41] Roberti Grosseteste — Epistolae, p. 68. For the career of John Blund see my Dictionary of Writers of Thirteenth Century England, pp. 56–58.

[42] Roberti Grosseteste — Epistolae, pp. 59–60. For him see also my Dictionary, pp. 73–75.

[43] Roberti Grosseteste — Epistolae, p. 250.

These items cannot be pressed very far, but one may well wonder if five years in Paris would sufficiently account for the degree of acquaintance. And with these must be considered Matthew Paris' statement that both France and England knew Grosseteste well.[44]

VII

If Grosseteste was closely associated with French royalty and with French bishops there for many years, he probably became acquainted with their administrative practices, especially since he had served earlier in clerical offices. Thus if French practices appear in Grosseteste's own administrative acts, they would serve as another indication that he had spent the years in question in France. Of course, if his practices merely followed the customs of his predecessors at Lincoln, they would tell little. If they differ they show some thought on his part and some discretion in their selection. These can be seen in his choice of seals and in expressions regarding time in his documents.

Several seals of Grosseteste as bishop of Lincoln remain in the British Museum. One is described as follows: "pointed oval; the Bishop full length, on a carved Gothic platform or bracket, lifting up the right hand in benediction, in the left hand a pastoral staff. In the field on either side, in a niche the head of a monk, one being possibly that of St. Hugh, Bishop of Lincoln. Background diapered lozenggy, with a small cinquefoil, places on the lines at each point of intersection. Above the niche on the right hand side the numeral iii, the bishop being the third Robert to hold the see." [45] The reverse showed "the Virgin, enthroned, in the right hand a sceptre fleury, in the left hand the Child. In base under an arch, with architectural details at the side the Bishop praying, "Ave Maria Gracia plena Do(mi)nus tecum." This seal is more complicated and thus presumably more advanced than those of contemporary France.[46]

[44] Chronica Majora (Rolls Series), V, 393, 404.

[45] Catalogue of Seals in the Department of Manuscripts in the British Museum, ed. W. de G. Birch, I, 258. From Add. Ch. 21, 881. It contains also on the front the name of Robert. I examined also seals on Add. Chs. 21,991 and 10,639. These were from 1239–41 A.D.

[46] See ibid., I, 271 for seal of Louis VIII of France: Douët d'Arcq, Inventaires et Documents, etc. Collection des Sceaux (Paris, 1863) I, p. xl (seals of Philip

Grosseteste did not copy his seal from that of his immediate predecessor, Hugh of Welles. The legend on the reverse of Grosseteste's seal is the same as that of an earlier bishop of Lincoln, William of Blois (1203–6) and of Richard Poore, bishop of Salisbury (1217–28).[47] He used the numeral 'iii' to indicate that he was the third bishop Robert of Lincoln. Such a number had appeared on the seals of Richard Fitz-Neal, bishop of London (1189–98).[48] The most distinctive feature, the two heads in the niches, was used by Canterbury Cathedral and by Archbishop Edmund, (1234–40), early in his episcopate.[49] Thus Grosseteste's choice of design was eclectic and indicates some thought on his part. It would seem to show no French influence.

French influence, however, may appear in Grosseteste's method of indicating chronology in some of his documents. He usually follows the English practice of giving the day of the month rather than the French custom of recording only the year and the month.[50] In this practice he seems to have followed that of his predecessor, Hugh of Welles, as bishop. In another matter there is a curious similarity between the custom of the French court of Louis VIII and that of Grosseteste: both dated the beginning of the years of their tenure from the death of their predecessors.[51] Since this seems to be unique in this period to these two,[52] it may

---

Augustus and Louis VIII); II, 545 (Garin, bishop of Senlis, high official at court of Philip Augustus); II, 534 (William of Aurillac, bishop of Paris) and others in the same volume.

[47] Catalogue of Seals in the Department, etc. For his predecessor see I, 258; for William of Blois, I, 257–58; for Richard, bishop of Salisbury, I, 341.

[48] For Richard, Bishop of London, ibid., p. 287; his successor, William, used the same device. Ibid., p. 288.

[49] Canterbury Cathedral, ibid., p. 190; Edmund of Abingdon, pp. 194–95.

[50] For the French practice see A. Teulet, ed. Layette du Trésor des Chartes (Paris, 1863): Philip Augustus, I, 552–53, 560b; bishops of Paris, I, 548, 554. For Hugh of Welles, British Museum, Add. Ch. 21,999; Grosseteste, Add. Chs. 10,639; 21,881.

[51] For Louis VIII's practice see C. Petit-Dutallis, Étude sur la vie et le règne de Louis VIII (1187–1226) (Paris, 1894), p. xii. Grosseteste dated his year from sometime in February. He gives February 1, 1249 as in his 14th year and February 27 and March 7, 1249 in his 15th year. Rotuli R. Grosseteste, pp. 112, 118, and 394. He was elected on March 25, 1235 and consecrated on June 2. Hugh died on February 2, 1235. However, it would appear that some of his archdeacons did not follow this practice. Note the sequence within the years in Rotuli R. Grosseteste, pp. 9–16, 23–26, 37–40, 400–01, 407–08 and 417–18, but see also p. 323.

[52] Philip Augustus counted the time from his consecration. L. Delisle, Catalogue des Actes de Philippe-Auguste (Paris, 1856), p. lxxiii. So did the English kings.

show the influence of the French court upon Grosseteste. Both may have felt that they should share the responsibility for what had been done by royal and episcopal agents in the interval before their acceptance of full responsibility.

VIII

There are some items in a manuscript of writings, many by Grosseteste, and a reference in a record which seem to connect him with Hereford after 1219. In the latter a Dominus Robert Grosseteste is a witness of a document whereby Hugh Foliot, bishop of Hereford (1219–34) received a presentation by Osbert, abbot of Haghmon.[53] This must be later than 1228, apparently the date of the death of the predecessor of Osbert as abbot.[54] It must be earlier than the death of the bishop in 1234 and even before 1233 when a Mr. Robert de Ywardeby appears as precentor since Thomas (Foliot) figures in the witness list as precentor.[55] Since the title, Master, is almost always given if held, the title accorded to the Robert Grosseteste in this document would seem to indicate a younger Robert who never became a master.[56] His presence at Hereford may well indicate the older Robert's previous connection with Hereford.

The manuscript (Durham Cathedral A III 12) was at one time in the possession of Bertram of Middleton who was prior of the cathedral 1244–58.[57] It was apparently in much the form then that it is today. "The volume is in some way closely connected with Grosseteste. Whoever owned and assembled its various parts was clearly in close touch with the pastoral theology of the period round about 1230." [58] Of first importance are three sets of notes

[53] Shropshire Archaeol. and Nat. Hist. Soc. Transactions, New Series, I (1878), 182.

[54] Ibid., p. 175.

[55] W. W. Capes, ed. Charters and Records of Hereford Cathedral (Hereford, 1908), p. 68. A William Foliot held the title apparently from about 1200 until after 1219. Ibid., pp. 37, 39, 43, 46, 47, 48. See also Le Neve, Fasti under the title.

[56] Rotuli R. Grosseteste, pp. 330, 332, 336.

[57] For this manuscript see A. G. Little and D. Douie, "Three sermons of Friar Jordan of Saxony, the Successor of St. Dominic, preached in England A.D. 1229," English Historical Review LIV (1939), 1–19, especially pp. 1–3; Thomson, Writings of Robert Grosseteste, pp. 13–17, 34–35.

[58] Little and Douie, p. 3.

in plummet in the manuscript thought by Thomson to be in the hand of Grosseteste.[59] On one quire (fols. 128–36) containing the Allegorie in Novum Testamentum of Hugh of St. Victor are "a number of good resolutions" dated February 27, 1231.[60] Since the quires seem to have a unity of their own, it would appear that Grosseteste carried them about separately and recorded memoranda on them. The resolutions seem to have had no connection with the treatise on the quire but indicate the state of mind of the writer. It will be remembered that Grosseteste did resign all but one of his preferments within two years after this memorandum.

At the beginning of the next quire which contains a miscellaneous series of sermons is a list of debts, probably to Grosseteste.[61] Helias Walensis owes 12d Parisienses. Master Richard of St. Illtud (de sancto Iltuto) mentioned there is probably also a Welshman, since St. Illtud was a Welsh saint. A Dominus Bricius who could also be a Welshman is named as a socius, as is also a William. The coins are all of Paris except for the mention of solidi Cremonenses. The books and other items suggest university activities. The expenses seem rather heavy and might suggest that Robert, William and Bricius were running a students' hall in Paris at the time. The third item also has strong Welsh or Herefordshire connections. It is among a series of sermons and dicta of Grosseteste (fol. 122) [62] and is apparently a note of expenses which presumably the author intended to record later in a regular account book. It is of the expenses of a certain Cadwallader going across the Severn to see a bishop at Merton. He crossed the Thames and returned by way of Bristol. Unfortunately there are not any dates in either of these notes and the men named do not seem to turn up in contemporary documents.

While it is possible that these items derive from Grosseteste's associations with Hereford about 1197–99 and Paris about 1209–14, it seems more probable that the undated notes are nearer in time to the one dated note of 1231. They suggest that

[59] Little and Douie, pp. 2–3; Thomson, Writings of Robert Grosseteste, pp. 14–15.

[60] See description in Little and Douie, pp. 1–3.

[61] Thomson, Writings of Robert Grosseteste, p. 15.

[62] Ibid., p. 15.

perhaps after the death of King Philip Augustus in 1223, Robert took up again his associations at the University of Paris and then was associated for a brief period with Bishop Hugh Foliot of Hereford before going to Oxford, perhaps in 1225. The information, difficult as it is, would be hard to fit into an unbroken association with Oxford from even 1218 to 1235 while a term with the French king would fit well into possibilities suggested by these items.

IX

When Grosseteste was elected bishop of Lincoln in 1235, the chroniclers naturally commented upon the election. Most of them state simply that he had been elected: among them was even Richard Morius, prior of Dunstable and former professor of law at Bologna.[63] The chronicle of Oseney near Oxford said that Grosseteste was very pleasant and had written much.[64] Roger of Wendover called him "honest and religious and sufficiently erudite in divine law."[65] Matthew Paris, as usual, had more to say: Grosseteste was "very renowned for letters and was educated in the schools from his earliest years," and "elegantly erudite in the trivium and quadrivium."[66] Even when Grosseteste died, Paris wrote most enthusiastically about him as a philosopher among other phases of his long life.[67] The rather lame praise of Wendover who alone mentions theology at Grosseteste's election, hardly suggests a long and distinguished career as a theologian.

The knowledge of the life of Grosseteste is advanced at several points by the evidence presented here. The Anglo-Norman religious poems of a conservative cast seem definitely to belong to

[63] Suggested in my Dictionary of Writers of Thirteenth Century England, p. 112 and confirmed by S. Kuttner and E. Rathbone, "Anglo-Norman Canonists of the Twelfth Century," Traditio VII (1949–51), 332.

[64] "Vir bene morigeratus et magne literature," Ann. Monast. (Rolls Series) IV, 82. "Morigeratus" apparently means striving to please.

[65] "Cui successit Magister Robertus Grosseteste, vir honestus et religiosus atque in lege divina sufficienter eruditus." (Rolls Series) III, 102.

[66] "Cui successit Magister Robertus cognomento Grosseteste, vir quidem nimis literatus, a primis annis scolis educatus," Chronica Majora (Rolls Series), III, 306.

[67] "Magnus enim habetur philosophus, Latinis et Grecis literis ad plenum eruditus, zelator justicie, lector in theologia scolis, predicator in populo, castitatis amator, persecutor simonialium." Ibid., V, 393.

his early years spent at Lincoln. He was more closely associated with Gerald of Wales than had been realized and his associations with Hereford and Wales may have continued or been renewed later in life. The incident of the refusal by Hugh, bishop of Lincoln, to give him the title of chancellor of Oxford would seem more nearly tied to the year 1209. The preferments which he held but which one can hardly say he enjoyed are better defined. The series of items bearing upon the vexed question of his activities in the years 1214–24 favor Bardney's statement that Grosseteste served a king, who must have been Philip Augustus. The study helps to strengthen one's confidence in the life by Bardney and thus to give more credence to his statement that Grosseteste studied at Cambridge.

ὅτι RECITATIVUM IN LUKE I 25, 61, II 23

The relatively frequent occurrence in the New Testament of the preposition ὅτι before passages of direct speech calls for an explanation. The following note does not aim at giving an explanation that would hold good in all cases where the usage is found, but it is confined to a few instances where ὅτι precedes passages of quoted speech in Luke; the suggestion proposed ought, perhaps, to be more closely explored.

Ὅτι occurs before passages of direct speech in Luke I 25, 61, III 12, IV 21, 41, 43, V 26, 36, [VI 5 T.R.] VII 4, 16 (*bis*) etc. We may add to these cases such instances where ὅτι introduces scripture quotations as in Luke II 23, IV 4, 10/11 etc. or the quotation of a nonscriptural saying as in Luke IV 24 etc.

Two possibilities of accounting for this usage suggest themselves to the readers:

(a) Is the usage to be explained as being based in the vulgar Greek of the New Testament period, and if so, was it the Evangelist himself who introduced it or did he follow, and copy, what he had found in (Greek) sources at his disposal?

(b) Should we suppose that behind the ὅτι lies the Aramaic particle דְּ? "Aramaic *dᵉ* has undoubtedly given rise to difficulties when it came to be rendered into Greek, and there may be several . . . instances of mistranslations." [1]

To this alternative there comes the third possibility that ὅτι *recitativum* might in some instances reproduce a Hebrew כִּי.

It is this third possibility which ought to be investigated more fully, though it is admitted that only in a limited number of cases could the Hebrew כִּי account for ὅτι *recitativum* in Lucan passages.

In the Old Testament כִּי occurs frequently in conjunction with quoted speech, but it is questionable whether we should read the כִּי as preceding and introducing the spoken words, or whether in fact it has to be read as part of the spoken passage itself. The only guide we possess for determining this question are translations of biblical passages made in ancient times by, or with the assistance of, Jews who spoke and knew ancient Hebrew. Even this guide is not very reliable as a survey of instances, selected at random, will show.

[1] Matthew Black: An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts (Oxford, 1946), p. 65.

Genesis XXI 30:

ויאמר כי את-שבע כבשת תקח מידי

καὶ εἶπεν [ἀβραὰμ] ὅτι τὰς ἑπτὰ ἀμνάδας ταύτας λήμψῃ παρ, ἐμοῦ
at [ille] septem inquit agnas accipies de manu mea

Genesis XXII 16:

נאם־יהוה כי יען אשר עשית את־הדבר הזה . . .

λέγει κύριος οὗ εἵνεκεν ἐποίησας τὸ ῥῆμα τούτο . . .
dicit dominus quia fecisti rem hanc . . .

Genesis XXVI 9:

ויאמר אליו יצחק כי אמרתי פן-אמות עליה

εἶπει δὲ αὐτῷ ἰσαάκ εἶπα γὰρ μὴ ποτε ἀπαθάνω δι' αὐτήν
respondit timui ne morer propter eam

Genesis XXVI 22:

ויאמר כי-עתה הרחיב יהוה לנו ופרינו בארץ

λέγων διότι νῦν ἐπλάτυνεν κύριος ἡμῖν καὶ ηὔξησεν ἡμᾶς ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς
dicens nunc dilatavit nos dominus et fecit crescere super terram

Genesis XXVII 20:

ויאמר כי הקרה יהוה . . . לפני

[ὁ δὲ] εἶπεν ὁ παρέδωκεν κύριος . . . ἐναντίον μου
. . . qui respondit voluntas dei fuit ut . . .

Genesis XXIX 32:

אמרה כי־ראה יהוה בעניי

λέγουσα διότι εἶδέν μου κύριος τὴν ταπείνωσιν
dicens vidit dominus humilitatem meam

Genesis XXXVII 35:

ויאמר כי־ארד אל־בני

λέγων ὅτι καταβήσομαι πρὸς τὸν υἱόν μου
et [sed] ait descendam ad filium meum

Joshua II 24:

ויאמר אל־יהושע כי נתן יהוה בידנו . . .

καὶ εἶπαν πρὸς ἰησοῦν ὅτι παρέδωκεν κύριος . . . ἐν χειρὶ ἡμῶν
atque dixerunt tradidit dominus . . . in manus nostras

The Greek translators of Genesis XXI 30, XXXVII 35 and Joshua II 24 apparently understood the Hebrew כי to introduce the quoted passage following upon it. The translators of Genesis XXII 16 (οὗ εἵνεκεν), XXVI 9 (εἶπα γάρ), XXVI 22 (διότι), XXVII 20 (untrans-

lated), XXIX 32 (διώτι) understood כי as being part of the spoken words in the sense of an asseveration.

More difficult is it to determine what Jerome understood the כי to signify in the above mentioned instances. He seems to have taken it as an introduction of the quoted passages in Genesis XXVI 9, XXVII 20, XXXVII 35 and Joshua II 24, though there could be doubts about this interpretation, and as a solemn emphasis — and thus part of the quoted words — in Genesis XXI 30, XXII 16, XXVI 22 and XXIX 32 It is in any case evident that the Vulgate differs from the Septuagint in the opinion on what the Hebrew כי stood for, and this difference may indicate that the explanations given to Jerome by his Jewish friends were at variance with what the earlier Greek translators understood the כי to signify in particular instances.

The Authorized Version takes the כי in all above instances as part of the spoken words, and to have the meaning of an emphatic assertion.

The casual character of this examination prohibits drawing any definite conclusions as to whether the Lucan ὅτι before direct speech might, in certain isolated cases, be due to a Hebrew source which had כי in the respective places. It seems that this may account at least for the usage in Luke I 61; the Hebrew כי may here have had the sense of an asseveration ("But surely, there is nobody in thy relationship who is called by this name") and it is possible that the translator rendered this כי by *what merely appears to be a* ὅτι *recitativum*. An ordinary ὅτι *causale* could, by being placed at the beginning of the sentence, have assumed the function of ὅτι *asseverativum*. When later this form of expression became obsolete and was no longer understood, the ὅτι was taken to be an introduction to the following words. It may be noted that Luther understood the Lucan ὅτι in this passage in the sense of כי and translated it accordingly by "doch," i.e. *he took it as being part of the spoken words, and not as their introduction*. It may also be noted that Jerome rendered ὅτι in all three places (Luke I 25, 61, II 23) by "quia" which perhaps indicates that the ὅτι was generally not understood to have — in these instances — the meaning "that," but rather the meaning of an asseveration. The readings in Luke I 25 and II 23 actually are susceptible of the same explanation as that in I 61, and could be rendered into English in the following manner:

I 25: . . . saying: TRULY, thus has the LORD done unto me.

II 23: . . . as is written in the Law of the LORD: FOR INDEED, every male . . . shall be consecrated to the LORD.

It must be stressed, however, that not all cases in which a ὅτι seemingly precedes a passage of quoted speech in the New Testament can be brought back to a Hebrew כִּי; ὅτι frequently occurs in the New Testament in the sense of διότι (as also in the Greek Old Testament) without any Hebrew source at its root. The concluding words in Mark II 12 and Luke V 26, respectively, might correctly be translated "Truly, never did we see the like of it" and "Surely, strange things have we seen today," but there is no reason for supposing a Hebrew כִּי as the source of the ὅτι in either passage.

PAUL WINTER

LONDON, ENGLAND

BOOKS RECEIVED

ARISTOTLE IN THE WEST; the Origin of Latin Aristotelianism. *By Fernand Van Steenberghen . . . Translated by Leonard Johnston* . . . Louvain, E. Nauwelaerts, 1955. 244 p.

AVGVSTINVS MAGISTER; Actes [de] Congrès International Augustinien, Paris, 21–24 Septembre 1954. Paris, Études Augustiniennes [1955?] 495 p. front.

THE BEGINNING OF UNITARIANISM IN AMERICA. *By Conrad Wright.* Boston, Published by Starr King Press, distributed by the Beacon Press [1955] 305 p.

LA CONSCIENCE CONCRÈTE. [*Par*] *Pantaleo Carabellese.* Choix de Textes, Traduction et Introduction *par Giuseppe Bufo et Luigi Aurigemma.* Paris, Aubier, Éditions Montaigne [1955] 218 p. (Philosophes Italiens)

CHRIST AND THE SCIENTIFIC ROAD. *By Purnell H. Benson* . . . Madison, N. J., Religion Through Scientific Study [1954] 26 p.

CONSCIENCE IN THE NEW TESTAMENT; a Study of Syneidesis in the New Testament; in the Light of its Sources, and with Particular Reference to St. Paul: with Some Observations Regarding its Pastoral Relevance Today. [*By*] *C. A. Pierce.* Chicago, Alec R. Allenson, Inc. [1955] 151 p. (Studies in Biblical Theology, no. 15)

THE DEFENSE OF THE FAITH. *By Cornelius Van Til* . . . Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, Published by the Presbyterian and Reformed Publishing Company, 1955. xii, 436 p.

GEISTESGESCHICHTE DES ANTIKEN CHRISTENTUMS. [*Von*] *Carl Schneider.* [Zwei Baender.] Muenchen, C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1954.

JESUS AND THE NON-JEWS. The Ethel M. Wood Lecture Delivered Before the University of London on 3 March 1954. *By T. W. Manson* . . . University of London, Athlone Press, 1955. 18 p.

HISTOIRE ECCLESIASTIQUE. LIVRES V–VII. [*De*] *Eusèbe de Césarée.* Texte Grec, Traduction et Notes *par Gustave Bardy* . . . Paris, Les Éditions du Cerf, 1955. viii, 238 p. (Sources Chrétiennes, 41)

UNE INSCRIPTION GRAVÉE SUR UN VASE CULTUEL MITHRIAQUE. *Par W. Vollgraff.* Amsterdam, N. V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij, 1955. pp. 205–218. (Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, AFD. Letterkunde. Nieuwe Reeks, Deel 18, No. 8).

MAIMONIDES; a Biography *by Solomon Zeitlin.* Second Edition. New York, Bloch Publishing Co., 1955. xviii, 234 p.

LE MINISTÈRE DANS L'ÉGLISE ANCIENNE (des années 90 à 410). [*Par*] *Gregory Dix. Préface de J. J. von Allmen. Traduction française de A. Jaermann et R. Paquier.* Neuchatel, Delachaux & Niestlé, 1955. 137 p. (Bibliothèque Théologique)

A MODERN PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION. *By Samuel M. Thompson.* . . . Chicago, Henry Regnery Company, 1955. xvii, 601 p.

Oeuvres de Saint Augustin. 2me Série: Dieu et Son Oeuvre; La Trinité (Livres I–VII) I. Le Mystère. Texte de l'Édition Bénédictine Traduction et Notes *par M. Mellet . . . et Th. Camelot . . .* Introduction *par E. Hendrikx . . .* [Paris] Desclée de Brouwer, 1955. 612 p.

Prejudice and Your Child. [*By*] *Kenneth B. Clark.* Boston, Beacon Press [1955] 151 p.

Les Reformateurs et la Fin des Temps. [*Par*] *T. F. Torrance . . .* Traduction française *de Roger Brandt.* Neuchatel, Delachaux & Niestlé, [1955] 41 p. (Cahiers Théologiques, 35)

La Rencontre d'Autrui: Remarques sur le Problème de la Communication. [*Par*] *Roger Mehl . . .* Neuchatel, Delachaux & Niestlé [1955] 60 p. (Cahiers Théologiques, 36)

S. Thomae de Aqvino, Ordinis Praedicatorum Svmma Theologiae, *Cura et Studio Instituti Studiorum Medievalium Ottaviensis* ad Textum S. Pii Pp. V Iussu Confectum Recognita. Tomvs Secvndvs complectens Primam Secvndae. Editio Altera Emendata. Ottawa, Canada, Commissio Piana, 1953.

Samothrace; A Guide to the Excavations and the Museum. *By Karl Lehmann.* [New York] New York University Press, 1955. 101 p. illus. (Published for the Institute of Fine Arts, New York University)

Studies in the Gospels; Essays in Memory of R. H. Lightfoot. *Edited by D. E. Nineham.* Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1955. xvi, 262 p. port.

Three Archbishops of Milwaukee: Michael Heiss (1818–1890); Frederick Katzer (1844–1903); Sebastian Messmer (1847–1930). *By Benjamin J. Blied.* Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 1955. 160 p.

The True and the Valid. *By Richard I. Aaron.* London, Oxford University Press, 1955. 22 p. (Friends of Dr. Williams's Library. Eighth Lecture, 1954)

What Is Truth[?] (Privately printed and published in the United States *by Jones B. Edwards.*) [c. 1955] 49 p. (Address of author: Pinebluff, N. C.)